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Abstract
Organizational research provides evidence that men and women differ in the structure of their personal networks as well as in the rewards attained from their personal networks (Ibarra 1992, 1993, 1995, 1997. The potential confound in past research between structural constraints and personal preferences has made it difficult to explain why men and women's networks are different regarding gender, status and relationship type. In this dissertation, I explain gender-based differences in networks through a framework of network preferences when seeking career-related advice with specific focus on three key variables: gender-based homophily, status, and relationship type. In Study 1 and Study 2, I test the effect of status alone and then the interaction between status and gender-based homophily to determine who men and women are most likely to approach when seeking career-related advice. I find that both men and women prefer higher-status others more than equal-status others when seeking career-related advice. I also find widespread gender-based homophily for women but limited gender-based homophily for men. In Study 3, given that individuals prefer seeking advice from higher status others as found in the prior studies, I only examine situations where there is a higher status advice-giver while further examining gender homophily and also building in the consideration of two relationship types, instrumental and multiplex, to understand their influence on men's and women's network preferences. I find that both men and women most prefer seeking advice from same-sex multiplex ties. However, because same-sex multiplex ties are not always available in organizations, I also examine their “next” preferences which reveal divergent findings between men and women. Women's next preference is a male with a multiplex tie, whereas men's next preference is either a male with an instrumental tie or a female with a multiplex tie, and for both men and women, instrumental ties with women are low on the preference hierarchy.

This dissertation contributes to research on personal networks because it highlights the complex psychology that drive network preferences regarding gender-based homophily, status and relationship type. It also offers methodological contributions in that all the studies utilized an experimental design where organizational composition constraints were eliminated and key variables were manipulated to establish causality.
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ABSTRACT

REACHING UP:
THE INFLUENCE OF GENDER, STATUS, AND RELATIONSHIP TYPE ON MEN’S AND WOMEN’S NETWORK PREFERENCES

Monica Mullick Stallings
Nancy Rothbard

Organizational research provides evidence that men and women differ in the structure of their personal networks as well as in the rewards attained from their personal networks (Ibarra 1992, 1993, 1995, 1997. The potential confound in past research between structural constraints and personal preferences has made it difficult to explain why men and women’s networks are different regarding gender, status and relationship type. In this dissertation, I explain gender-based differences in networks through a framework of network preferences when seeking career-related advice with specific focus on three key variables: gender-based homophily, status, and relationship type. In Study 1 and Study 2, I test the effect of status alone and then the interaction between status and gender-based homophily to determine who men and women are most likely to approach when seeking career-related advice. I find that both men and women prefer higher-status others more than equal-status others when seeking career-related advice. I also find widespread gender-based homophily for women but limited gender-based homophily for men. In Study 3, given that individuals prefer seeking advice from higher status others as found in the prior studies, I only examine situations where there is a higher status advice-giver while further examining gender homophily and also building in the consideration of two relationship types, instrumental and multiplex, to understand their influence on
men’s and women’s network preferences. I find that both men and women most prefer seeking advice from same-sex multiplex ties. However, because same-sex multiplex ties are not always available in organizations, I also examine their “next” preferences which reveal divergent findings between men and women. Women’s next preference is a male with a multiplex tie, whereas men’s next preference is either a male with an instrumental tie or a female with a multiplex tie, and for both men and women, instrumental ties with women are low on the preference hierarchy.

This dissertation contributes to research on personal networks because it highlights the complex psychology that drive network preferences regarding gender-based homophily, status and relationship type. It also offers methodological contributions in that all the studies utilized an experimental design where organizational composition constraints were eliminated and key variables were manipulated to establish causality.
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Chapter One: Introduction

Leaders and managers of workplace diversity in large organizations are beset with the challenge of retaining and promoting women to top management levels. In 2008, women made up almost half of the U.S. labor force (46.5%) and slightly more than half (50.8%) of the managerial and professional positions in the U.S. labor force (Bureau of Labor Statistics). Both of these impressive statistics, however, become discouraging when compared to 15.7% of women in Fortune 500 corporate officer positions and only 3.0% of women in Fortune 500 CEO positions in 2008, particularly when these percentages have shown minimal increase over the past 10 years (11.2% of women in Fortune 500 corporate officer positions in 1998; and 0.4% of women in Fortune 500 CEO positions in 1998) (Bureau of Labor Statistics; Catalyst). As a result of this considerable disconnect between the pipeline of women in managerial positions (50.8% in 2008) and the percentage of women who reach corporate offices positions in the Fortune 500 (15.7% in 2008), the question that scholars have been grappling with for a long time is: Why aren’t more women being promoted to top management positions in organizations? This is a complex question, and multiple factors, including voluntary reasons, play a role. However, it is reasonable to assume that more than 15.7% of women were qualified and had the desire to hold corporate officer positions in 2008’s Fortune 500 (Catalyst) which raises a more poignant question: What is inhibiting women who want to ascend the organizational hierarchy from doing so?

Past research has established that personal networks in the workplace are important for individual career advancement and success for both men and women (Morrison, Van Velsor & White, 1987; Davies-Netzley, 1998). Powerful networks in
organizations are beneficial for numerous reasons including increased motivation, higher performance (e.g. Hackman & Oldham, 1980; Spreitzer, 1996), and promotion to upper-management levels (Brass, 1985). Other studies supporting the value of personal networks further suggest that asking for career advice and mentorship from multiple individuals is a critical aspect of individual success in the workplace (Thomas & Kram, 1998; Higgins & Kram, 2001). Given that men and women are ascending organizational hierarchies at considerably different rates, it is possible that differences in the composition and usage of their personal networks, particularly when it comes to seeking career-related advice, might to some degree account for the small percentage of women who succeed in ascending to the top levels of organizations.

Organizational research provides evidence that men and women differ in the structure of their personal networks as well as in the rewards attained from their personal networks (Ibarra 1992, 1993, 1995, 1997). One explanation addressing gender differences in network structure suggested by prior research is that women have less access to important organizational networks compared to men (Kanter, 1977; Harlan & Weiss, 1982; Ragins & Sundstrom, 1990). Differential access is considered a structural constraint because it is most likely caused by organizational barriers such as work group composition (Brass, 1985) or rank (Ibarra, 1992). The structural perspective claims that contextual factors and boundaries explain the reasons why men and women choose to form different types of associations (Fischer & Oliker, 1983). Particularly if the tendency for women to build relationships with other women exists, a phenomenon called homophily (Rogers and Kincaid, 1981), Ibarra (1993) suggests that structural variables like organizational composition, or the fact that women are often less likely than men to
hold high status positions in organizations, may limit women’s ability to create powerful social networks, whereas men are not as likely to face these same constraints. Hence, if the rationale holds true, women will have a narrower range of network choices than men.

Other studies (Ibarra, 1993; Ibarra, 1997) recognize that women and men may choose to form and maintain different types of relationships based on personal preferences which lead to overall gender differences in network structure. For instance, past research has shown that men have a greater number of instrumental ties, or relationships that provide job-related resources, in their networks than women, while women have a greater number of expressive ties, or relationships that provide emotional and social support, in their networks compared to men (Ibarra, 1993; Ibarra, 1997). However, it is difficult to distinguish between structural constraints and personal preferences in field-based studies, and even though past research has made it clear that men and women have different networks, the potential confound between structural constraints and personal preferences makes it nearly impossible to explain why men and women’s networks are different (Ibarra, 1993; Ibarra, 1997).

While prior research has identified gender differences in network structure and network rewards regarding key variables such as gender-based homophily, status and relationship type, few studies have delved into why men and women have different networks and how these disparate networks lead to varying levels of network rewards. It is possible that different networks result as a consequence of individuals’ personal preferences to form and maintain certain types of relationships. For instance, Ibarra’s (1993, 1997) findings that women have more expressive, or supportive, relationships while men tend to form a greater number of instrumental relationships may be a
consequence of gender preferences in network formation, or what I will refer to as
network preferences. Studying preferences is important because they inform us about
what types of networks people would likely build free from organizational constraints.

For almost two decades in network research, the potential confound between
structural constraints and personal preferences has made it difficult to explain the
psychological complexities behind why men and women’s networks are different
regarding gender, status and relationship type. This dissertation sets out to explain
gender-based differences in networks through a framework of network preferences: How
do men’s and women’s network preferences differ regarding gender-based homophily,
status, and relationship type when seeking career-related advice?

As a preview of this dissertation, I first test the effect of status alone and then the
interaction between status and gender-based homophily to determine who men and
women are most likely to approach when seeking career-related advice (Chapter Two).
As predicted, I find that both men and women prefer higher-status others more than
equal-status others when seeking career related advice. I also find widespread gender-
based homophily for women but more limited gender-based homophily for men. In the
next chapter (Chapter Three), given that men and women prefer seeking advice from
higher status others as found in Chapter Two, I only examine situations where there is a
higher status advice-giver while further examining gender homophily and also building in
the consideration of two relationship types, instrumental and multiplex, to understand
their influence on men’s and women’s network preferences. Instrumental relationships
primarily provide the exchange of job-related resources, whereas multiplex relationships
provide the exchange of both job-related and emotional or social supportive resources.
As predicted, I find that both men and women most prefer seeking advice from same-sex multiplex ties. However, because same-sex multiplex ties are not always available in organizations, I also examine their “next” preferences which reveal divergent findings between men and women. Women’s next preference is multiplex ties with a male, whereas men’s next preference is either an instrumental tie with a male ties or a multiplex tie with a female, and for both men and women, the instrumental ties with women is low on the preference hierarchy. It is through examining both first and “next” preferences that I am able to disentangle the structural constraints from personal preferences. Last, I summarize the results of the studies and discuss the implications and contributions of this research (Chapter Four).

This dissertation contributes to research on personal networks in that it highlights the complex psychology that drives network preferences regarding status and gender-based homophily (Chapter Two). From a theoretical standpoint, it establishes that both men and women prefer high-status others more than equal-status others when seeking career-related advice. It also more fully articulates how the mechanism of gender-based homophily, as it pertains to status and network preferences, is more widespread for women but more limited for men. From a practical standpoint, this dissertation highlights the importance of high-status women in the workplace for both men and women and may even further encourage global heads of diversity to continue in their efforts to increase the percentage of women in the top levels of the organization.

This dissertation also contributes to network research in that it more fully explains network preferences regarding relationship type and gender-based homophily when high status is held constant (Chapter Three). Whereas prior research suggests that men and
women tend to have instrumental ties with men (Ibarra 1992, 1997), this dissertation shows that if available, women most prefer multiplex ties with women and replicates prior findings that men prefer multiplex ties with men. This dissertation also finds that when men and women have to trade-off either relationship type or gender, men are willing to seek career-related advice from either instrumental ties with men or multiplex ties with women showing that for men there are situations where homophily and relationship type are substitutes for one another. Women, on the other hand, when faced with the decision of choosing between gender-based homophily or relationship type show a clear preference for multiplex ties with men over instrumental ties with women suggesting they are willing to trade off gender-based homophily for the multiplex relationship type.

Finally, this dissertation offers methodological contributions in that all the studies utilized an experimental design where organizational composition constraints were eliminated and variables of interest were manipulated to establish causality. Furthermore, employing the vignette technique allowed the incorporation of a realistic work situation and provided the exact same work situation to both men and women across all the studies which helped to distinguish between personal preference and availability more clearly.
Chapter Two: Reaching up: The Influence of Status and Gender on Men’s and Women’s Network Preferences

**Introduction**

Individuals who build strong networks in the workplace often increase their likelihood of career success through advantages such as increased motivation, higher performance (e.g. Hackman & Oldham, 1980; Spreitzer, 1996), and promotion to upper-management levels (Brass, 1985). A critical component of building strong networks is forging connections with higher status others because higher status others are likely to provide career advice, potential career opportunities, and even career sponsorship (Higgins & Kram, 2001; Thomas; Burt, 1998). Other studies that corroborate these findings suggest that reaching across status hierarchies and asking for mentorship from multiple individuals is a critical aspect of career success (Thomas & Kram, 1998; Higgins & Kram, 2001). However, higher status others in the workplace, operationalized in this paper by those who hold higher level positions in the organizational hierarchy, are often disproportionately men potentially posing a challenge for junior level women as they attempt to build connections with senior status others (Ibarra, 1992). Furthermore, numerous studies suggest that women have a natural affinity toward other women because of their like-mindedness, solidarity, and other similar characteristics known as gender-based homophily, possibly making women even less likely to connect with the plethora of senior status men (McPherson & Smith-Lovin, 1986). To further complicate women’s network choices in the workplace, research scholars argue that gender status beliefs, which are widely shared societal beliefs espousing that “men are more socially valued and diffusely more competent than women”, often act as rules which influence
social interaction (Correll, 2004, p. 98). Therefore, the pervasiveness of gender beliefs may cause junior level men and women to avoid senior status women, even when they are available. With all of these conflicting mechanisms, it is difficult to discern men’s and women’s network preferences concerning status and gender as they attempt to strengthen their informal networks in the workplace.

In this paper, the interplay of status and gender on men’s and women’s network preferences when seeking career-related advice will be examined in a controlled laboratory setting which offers equal representation of male and female advice-givers at various hierarchical levels of an organization. A controlled laboratory setting, as opposed to a field study, makes it possible to identify men’s and women’s ideal unconstrained network preferences regarding status and gender. With the identification of ideal network preferences, addressing shortcomings and instituting changes in the workplace to increase the likelihood of career success for both men and women would be more achievable. Therefore, the first question this paper focuses on has to do with status alone: Do men and women prefer seeking career-related advice from higher status individuals or equal status individuals? The second set of questions involves both status and gender: Among higher status individuals, do men and women prefer approaching same-sex or opposite-sex individuals for career-related advice? And, among equal status individuals, do men and women prefer approaching same-sex or opposite-sex individuals for career-related advice?

**Conceptualizing Status**

Status can be defined in two distinct ways. First, status can be conceptualized as a societal evaluation comparing two distinct social groups (Weber, 1968). For example,
society establishes widely accepted status differences between professions (e.g., postal workers vs. doctors), between racial groups (e.g., blacks vs. whites), and between men and women (Ridgeway & Erickson, 2000, p. 579). Second, status can be defined in terms of the position individuals hold in a hierarchy such as in organizations, institutions, or government bodies where status differences are perceived through differences in knowledge, influence, and experience (Fisek, Berger, and Norman, 1991; Goffman, 1970; Skvoretz and Fararo 1996; Ridgeway & Erickson, 2000, p.580). In this paper, both ascribed and achieved status will be examined as they relate to men’s and women’s network preferences in the workplace.

As already established, status is based on perceived inequalities between groups or individuals. Status inequalities are driven by status beliefs which are widely accepted societal beliefs that identify one social group as more competent and revered than another social group (Berger, Fisek, Norman, and Zelditch, 1977; Webster and Foschi, 1988). The way status inequalities come about and persist can be explained through status construction theory which argues that status beliefs are created in social interactions where opposing categories of people come together to determine the allocation of resources, and through such interactions, other social worth and competency differences become salient (Ridgeway 1991, 1997, 2000; Ridgeway & Balkwell, 1997; Webster and Hysom, 1998). Furthermore, social interaction among individuals acts as an incubator where status beliefs are not only created, but also enacted and diffused (Ridgeway, 1991; Ridgeway & Balkwell, 1997). Repeated social interactions diffuse status beliefs across a broad population giving way to widely shared societal beliefs (Ridgeway & Balkwell, 1997).
Status inequalities specify which individuals and groups hold more value than other individuals and groups. In this status ordering, higher status individuals and groups are not only evaluated as more competent and capable, but they also enjoy more rewards, privileges and even respect. Therefore, it makes sense that individuals would be status seeking in order to receive more recognition and rewards. Past literature has demonstrated that individuals primarily seek status to attain more resources, both tangible and intangible (Huberman, Lock & Onculer, 2004; Lin 1990, 1994). The approach theory of power posits that individuals are motivated to engage in status-seeking behavior when having higher status is specifically linked to tangible rewards and resources (Anderson & Berdahl, 2002; Keltner, Gruenfeld & Anderson, 2003). Other research claims that individuals are motivated to engage in status-seeking for status itself, a behavior called “intrinsic status-seeking”, resulting in a less tangible and less rational reward (Huberman, Lock & Onculer, 2004; Barkow, 1989; Emerson, 1962; Frank, 1988). Gaining status has been called an “ego-reward” by early sociologists, “a highly valued emotional good that could be given by a lower-powered partner in an exchange to increase the higher-powered partner’s ‘emotional investment’ and make the power balance more equal,” (Huberman et. al., p. 104). Whether the rewards are tangible or intangible, individuals are often motivated to seek status.

**Status signals**

Once gained, status may be signaled in various ways. Status characteristics theory (Berger et. al., 1977; Ridgeway 2001; Ridgeway & Berger, 1986) states that there are two primary types of status characteristics, achieved and ascribed (also known as specific and diffuse), that can cue status (Humphreys & Berger, 1981; Hembroff &
Myers, 1984). Achieved characteristics, such as training or education related to a specific task or activity, tend to vary across situations because of their different levels of situational relevance while, ascribed characteristics, such as gender or ethnicity, tend to influence relatively consistently across situations and are thought to signal an individual’s overall competence or aptitude level (Berger, Rosenholtz and Zelditch, 1980). Past research has described the process of forming status judgments as either effortless or effortful cognitive processes (Goodwin, Gubin, Fiske, & Yzerbyt, 2000), where ascribed characteristics typically induce effortless or subconscious cognitive processes as opposed to achieved characteristics which induce effortful or conscious cognitive processes.

The formal position an individual holds within an organizational hierarchy is an example of a achieved status characteristic that is often related to conscious status judgments because it is “associated with assigned authority, responsibility, and discretion over a range of resources and decision areas,” (Tushman & Romanelli, 1983, p. 12). Furthermore, formal positions within an organization are considered achieved characteristics because the status they evoke is usually only relevant in professional situations. Indeed, formal positions are often a reflection of an employee’s contribution, value, and overall competence level because of the inherent inequality created in a hierarchy of formal positions characteristic in many organizations (Huberman, Lock & Onculer, 2004). Inequality is created because individuals in higher positions have more privileges and resources than individuals in lower positions, and individuals in leadership positions have earned the right and opportunity to influence others more so than someone in an entry-level position (Shelly & Webster, 1997). In addition, acquiring a higher position in a firm normally requires that the individual qualifies based on skills,
experience, and past success. As a result, people in high-level positions of an organization are often perceived as having higher levels of competence, more experience, more accumulated firm-specific knowledge and the ability to gain access to and accrue more resources than people in lower-level positions (Shelly & Webster, 1997). Given these advantages, it is likely that individuals who are seeking career-related advice would expect more valuable advice from individuals in higher-level positions than individuals in equal-level positions. Although it may be more comfortable and effortless to seek advice from equal status individuals, the multitude of advantages associated with higher level positions and the prospect of receiving more valuable advice are likely to motivate individuals to step outside of their comfort zone and put forth the extra effort to approach higher-status others. Therefore, given the status-seeking resource arguments articulated above, I hypothesize:

**Hypothesis 1 (H1):** When seeking career-related advice, both men and women are more likely to approach individuals who are at a higher organizational level than individuals who are at the same organizational level.

**Status and Gender**

The gender of an individual is considered an ascribed status characteristic that is often associated with subconscious or effortless status judgments. Gender is one of the most dominant and self-effacing characteristics by which we distinguish ourselves, group ourselves, confer status, and allocate societal functions (Berdahl, 2007, p. 12). The use of gender as a key status characteristic promotes gender hierarchy, a social system in which one sex enjoys higher status over the other (Berdahl, 2007). Gender hierarchy is in place in many cultures across the globe where men control most of the wealth and males are considered to be higher status than females (Buss, 1989; Connell, 1987; Connell, 1995;
Williams & Best, 1990). Scholars who have conducted empirical studies find support of the widely shared belief that “men are more capable (Williams and Best 1990:334) and competent (Fiske et al., 2002: 892) than women,” (Correll, 2004, p. 97).

While gender is a common status characteristic that many people both consciously and subconsciously use as a measuring stick to predict competence, gender is a key component of a more complex system which scholars call “The Gender System” which captures the stepwise process by which individuals assess competence of self and others in a social situation (Ridgeway & Correll, 2004). The gender system is comprised of three components— the social relational context, automatic sex categorization, and gender beliefs— and together these lead to a judgment of status and competence. However, the gender system is often considered a "background identity" because other identities and social factors relevant to the situation manage to climb ahead of gender in the hierarchy of importance. Even still, scholars like Ridgeway and Correll (2004) argue that even though the gender system may seem to fade in the background, it can still be powerful because of its ability to create small biases over time which can lead to significantly different success paths for both men and women. Other research suggests that ascribed status characteristics, such as gender and race, interact with achieved status characteristics, like firm rank or tenure, before an overall status judgment is made (e.g. Phillips, Rothbard, & Dumas, 2009; Berger et al., 1974; Fiske & Taylor, 1991; etc.).

Social Relational Context

The first component of the gender system is called the social relational context, and it is the setting where “individuals define themselves in relation to others in order to act,” (Ridgeway & Correll, 2004, p. 511). The reason why the social relational context is
an important component of the gender system is because it determines whether or not gender is salient. In other words, the situation either can activate the importance of gender or suppress it. In this paper, the social relational context is a dyadic situation that frequently occurs in management organizations where participants must determine their likelihood of approaching a co-worker for career advice. In this particular situation, gender is likely to be activated as a status cue if participants because within each status condition, either equal-status or higher-status, the participant is presented with a male co-worker and then a female co-worker. However, gender as a status characteristic only becomes salient when participants make the judgment, either consciously or subconsciously, that male co-workers will be able to offer better career advice than female co-workers (Wagner & Berger, 1993).

**Automatic Sex Categorization**

The next component of the gender system is called automatic sex categorization, a “process linking social relational context and gender beliefs” and a primary tool individuals use for interaction, (Ridgeway and Correll, 2000 p.111). In any social situation where individuals come together, a subconscious sex categorization process of each other ensues in order to predict behavior, react and increase the ability to relate with others (Brewer and Lui, 1989; Stangor et. al., 1992). While individuals rely on gender categorization first, other categorization processes often follow to help predict behavior because gender is too broad of a category to predict behavior accurately in many situations (Ridgeway and Correll, 2000). Even though sex categorization usually cannot alone accurately predict behavior in a social interaction, it becomes powerful as individuals default to subsequent categorization processes because gender is often
embedded in the other identities changing their meanings, even if only by a small amount, (Brewer & Lui, 1989; Stangor et. al. 1992).

**Gender Beliefs**

The final component of the gender system is called gender beliefs. Gender beliefs are derived from gender at the macro level where gender is perceived as a position in society’s social structure, as opposed to the micro-level where gender is an identity a person attaches to himself (Stets & Burke, 1996, p. 193). More specifically, gender beliefs are the expectations attached to gender when it is perceived as a position in society. Gender beliefs are narrowly defined and thought of as a subset of gender stereotypes because they only have to do with status, or beliefs that elevate men above women in terms of value and competence (Wagner and Berger, 1997). Even though gender beliefs may seem outdated and even offensive to today’s career woman, social interaction becomes a conduit for the reinforcement and perpetuation of gender beliefs, and they become persistent over time, (Ridgeway & Erickson, 2000).

Expectation states theory, or the unconscious predictions of other people’s behavior, helps to determine which category of people will fare better than the other and further specifies the creation of status beliefs (Berger et. al. 1977; Webster & Foschi 1988; Fisek et. al. 1991). In social interaction where gender is salient, gender status beliefs specify “a power and prestige order among men and women,” (Ridgeway & Smith-Lovin, 1999, p. 200). These social differences become codified into gender status beliefs which are largely accepted by both men and women, called consensual beliefs, and these beliefs are carried forth to subsequent interactions perpetuating status beliefs.
across a broad population (Ridgeway 1991, 1997, 2000; Ridgeway and Balkwell, 1997; Webster and Hysom, 1998; Ridgeway & Erickson, 2000, p. 581).

Men and Status

The gender system undeniably elevates men’s status above women’s status. Therefore, when seeking career-related advice, men are more likely to approach men than women because: first, men seem to recognize and value status more than women (Buss, 1999); second, men tend to be more status-seeking than women (Buss, 1999); and third, because gender beliefs espouse that men are more competent than women, it follows that men will be able to offer higher quality career advice than women. The tendency for men to value status is often displayed in men’s sparse networks where men are connected to others who span a broad hierarchical range, potentially making men care more about status in relationship development than women. Boys’ friendship patterns also support this notion in the way boys tend to connect with numerous other children, or are said to have larger networks of friends compared to girls who seem to prefer fewer, more intimate friendships (Lever, 1978; Eder & Hallinan, 1978; Van Brunschot, Zarbatany, & Strang, 1993). As boys tend to run in wider circles than girls, their visibility is more likely to be increased which also may increase their overall status level (Deptula, Cohen, Phillipsen & Ey, 2006; Parker & Asher, 1993). If true, repeated success at gaining status in childhood may cause men to continue to seek status in adulthood. If men view the male gender as an ascribed status characteristic signaling increased status and competence over females, and those men are status-seeking, then men will more likely to seek career-related advice from men than women in both the equal and higher-status conditions.
There is a second reason that men might seek out career-related advice from other men, gender-based homophily. One premise of homophily is that when people connect based on similarity, like gender, it often makes communication simpler and easier, and it may even help in predicting others’ responses and behavior (Festinger, 1957; Werner and Parmeelee, 1979; Hamm, 2000). Not only effort, but also a sense of risk and unknown is reduced when individuals connect with similar others. While there is no guarantee, gender homophilous ties have a greater likelihood of success and stability over time (Felmlee, Sprecher, & Bassin, 1990). Even though men and women make up equal proportions in the population, their one-to-one ratio becomes skewed in certain subsets of the environment, like organizations (McPherson & Smith-Lovin 1982, 1986, 1987; Popielarz, 1999). In places where the sex composition is made up of more men than women, like in firms, it is likely that men’s networks are significantly gender-homophilous, particularly at the upper levels of the organization where the sex composition is mostly men (Ibarra 1992, 1997; Brass 1985). Past research further suggests that the pattern of gender-homophily becomes even more pronounced when individuals “consider instrumental or status-loaded ties of advice, respect, and mentoring (Ibarra 1992, 1997; Lincoln & Miller, 1979; Greenberger & Sorenson, 1971” (McPherson Smith-Lovin, & Cook, 2001, p. 424). Recognizing it is difficult to untangle the status mechanism from the relational mechanism driving gender-based homophily for men, I hypothesize:

**Hypothesis 2a (H2a):** When seeking career-related advice from individuals at a higher organizational level, men are more likely to approach men than women.

**Hypothesis 2b (H2b):** When seeking career-related advice from individuals at an equal organizational level, men are more likely to approach men than women.

*Women and Status*
While the gender system can play a significant role for both men and women in the subconscious status ratings of others, status alone may not dictate women’s network choices in organizations. Past research has found that women also value outcomes like closeness and relationship formation (Ibarra, 1992). Relationship scholars further suggest that women’s tendency to form dense network structures is an indication that women value intimacy (Ibarra, 1992; Lever, 1978, Eder & Hallinan, 1978; Van Brunschot, Zarbatany, & Strang, 1993). One explanation why women may value closeness even more so than status is that as early as childhood, some researchers argue, girls are socialized into expressive roles which emphasize friendship and support, whereas boys are socialized into instrumental roles which emphasize accessing resources and problem-solving (Parsons & Bales, 1955). Therefore, to increase the likelihood of achieving close and meaningful relationships in the workplace, women are likely to reach out to other women, a well-documented phenomenon called gender-based homophily and an important variable in relationship development (Ibarra, 1992; Brass, 1985). Homophily is the tendency of individuals to interact with similar others, where similarity is defined as some common group identity or affiliation such as gender, race or education (Ibarra, 1992; Rogers and Kincaid, 1981). Gender, as previously mentioned in the automatic sex categorization process, is one of the most dominant characteristics by which we identify ourselves, organize ourselves and distinguish ourselves (Berdahl, 2007). Past research suggests that gender-based homophily is one of the most common types of homophily that individuals rely on, particularly in organizational settings (Ibarra, 1992; Brass, 1985).

The need for gender-based homophily, or the tendency to gravitate toward same-sex others, often becomes important for individuals as early as preadolescence.
Childhood friendship patterns strongly demonstrate that girls prefer interacting with fewer friends and in smaller groups than boys (Lever, 1978; Eder & Hallinan, 1978; Van Brunschot, Zarbatany, & Strang, 1993). Girls also display a particular affinity for dyads, or one-on-one interactions, where girls often achieve an increased level of intimacy through acts of self-disclosure (Eder & Hallinan, 1978; Van Brunschot et. al.1993; Phillipsen, 1999; Samter, 2003). It has been found that girls view intimate conversation as important and meaningful which is consistent with both dyadic relationships and a desire to self-disclose (e.g. Berndt, 1981, 1982; Parker & Asher, 1993). Especially when adolescents are between the ages of 8 and 10 years of age, an unsettling sense of loneliness often arises which is caused by the need to interact on a platonic, but intimate, interpersonal level (Parker & Asher 1993; Hodges et. al. 1999). Friendship with same-sex others may be the cure which satiates this need for deep interpersonal communication (Sullivan, 1953). Sullivan (1953) calls these types of relationships “chumships” where children learn the meaning of collaboration and rely on this foundation for relationships with others throughout adulthood (Sullivan, 1953).

As women enter the workforce, the need to stick together may be even more important. One piece of evidence supporting this notion is the common occurrence for women to formally gather themselves in support of each other, the enactment of gender-based homophily, in the business world (e.g., women on Wall Street) as well as other arenas (e.g., National Organization for Women (NOW)) in reaction to perceptions of male dominance (Aldrich, 1989). Therefore, it follows that women would informally engage in gender-based homophily in the workplace for similar reasons like finding a kind of safe haven or gaining a sense of solidarity with other women (Belliveau, 2005;
Mollica, Gary, & Trevino 2003). Either way, gender-based homophily seems to provide a sense of comfort for women who feel dominated by men in the workplace because interacting with similar others, particularly when attraction is based on a salient social characteristic such as gender, creates a type of bond which often facilitates communication and promotes trust (Ibarra, 1992, p. 423). Whereas men’s tendency toward gender-based homophily may be driven by a status mechanism (see H2a and H2b), women’s tendency toward gender-based homophily may be driven by a relational mechanism. Therefore, I hypothesize:

**Hypothesis 3a (H3a):** When seeking career-related advice from individuals at a higher organizational level, women are more likely to approach women than men.

**Hypothesis 3b (H3b):** When seeking career-related advice from individuals at an equal organizational level, women are more likely to approach women than men.

**METHOD**

*Overview*

A mixed-model experimental design was used to test the status hypothesis (H1) and the status and gender hypotheses (H2 and H3). I tested the status hypothesis (H1), which predicted that both men and women are more likely to seek career-related advice from higher-status advice-givers than an equal-status advice-givers, using a 2 (participant, or advice-seeker, gender: male vs. female) x 2 (advice-giver status: higher than advice-seeker vs. equal to advice-seeker) between subjects design that also included a within subjects factor that had two levels, (advice-giver gender: male vs. female). The status of the advice-giver was manipulated by varying information regarding position in an organizational hierarchy which acts as a status signal (Berger, Fisek, Norman, & Zelditch, 1977; Hollander, 1958). In order to test the status and gender hypotheses (H2 and H3), which predicted that within the higher status condition and within the equal
status condition, both men and women are more likely to seek career-related advice from same-sex others than opposite-sex others, the same mixed-model experimental design was used. The experimental manipulation of sex of the advice-giver was based on work by Heilman and colleagues (2004, 2006, 2007), where information about sex of the advice-giver was manipulated by the name in the brief description given in each condition (i.e., Jennifer or Steve).

**STUDY 1**

*Participants and Design*

Participants consisted of 78 male and 96 female students of a large northeastern university who were recruited by the university’s behavioral laboratory.\(^1\) The sample was made up of 93.7% undergraduate and 6.3% graduate students ranging in age from 18 to 44 years with a Mean age of 20.4 years. This experiment employed a mixed model design with 2 between subjects factors and one within subjects factor, or a 2 (participant gender or advice-seeker: male vs. female) \(\times\) 2 (advice-giver status: higher than vs. equal to participant) between subjects factors, and, in addition, a within subjects factor that had two levels, (advice-giver gender: male vs. female).

*Materials and Procedure*

The study was presented to participants as an exploration in career trajectories. Participants were randomly assigned to one of four experimental conditions which were manipulated using a computer-based vignette and survey instrument (see Appendix 1). Directions explicitly stated that each participant should imagine himself/herself as the protagonist described in the scenario. The vignette describes the protagonist as a solid

---

\(^1\) Subjects came to the behavioral laboratory to participate in one hour’s worth of experiments of which this study was one, and in return each subject received $10.
performer in his/her role as an Analyst in the Mergers & Acquisitions (M&A) division of a Wall Street investment bank. A professional quandary arises because the protagonist applied to business school and was admitted to two of the nation’s top 15 MBA programs, but neither school is in the top 5. The protagonist is perplexed about his/her next career move as he/she weighs the following options: 1) forego business school and continue to rise at the firm, 2) go to one of the business schools that offered him/her an acceptance, or 3) reapply to business school next year in hopes of getting into a top 5 program.

In order to navigate this complicated career decision process, the protagonist considers approaching someone in the M&A group for advice. The vignette specifies that there are a handful of potential advice-givers, both male and female who are at various hierarchical levels and who are performing well in the M&A group, that the protagonist is considering approaching. Then, a brief description of the first potential advice-giver is given with a status manipulation, activated by the phrase “is at a higher level than you in the firm” or “is at the same level as you in the firm”, and with a gender manipulation activated by the person’s name, either Jennifer or Steve. Based on this description, the participant who is acting as the protagonist, is asked a set of questions including how likely he/she would be to approach this potential advice-giver for career advice. Then, the participant is given a brief characterization of a second potential advice-giver who is at the same status level as the prior advice-giver, but the opposite gender. The participant, who is acting as the protagonist, is then given a second set of questions based on the second potential advice-giver. Once the participant begins answering questions about the second potential advice-giver, he/she cannot scroll back
and change answers regarding the first potential advice-giver. The first within subjects protagonist introduced, either Steve or Jennifer, was randomized.

**Experimental manipulations**

*Sex of advice-giver*. Information about sex of the advice-giver was manipulated by the name in the brief description given in each condition (i.e., Jennifer or Steve). This manipulation is consistent with several studies on gender differences and career outcomes done by Heilman and colleagues (e.g. Heilman, et. al., 2004; Heilman & Welle, 2006; Heilman & Okimoto, 2007; etc.) where the sex of a target was controlled by name.

*Status of advice-giver*. Status of the advice-giver was manipulated in the brief description of the potential advice-giver by a status manipulation, activated by the phrase “is at a higher level than you in the firm” or “is at the same level as you in the firm”. The formal position an individual holds within an organizational hierarchy is an example of a achieved status characteristic that is often related to conscious status judgments and often reflects an employee’s contribution, value, and overall competence level because of the inherent inequality created in a hierarchy of formal positions (Berger, Fisek, Norman, & Zelditch, 1977; Hollander, 1958; Tushman & Romanelli, 1983; Huberman, Lock & Onculer, 2004). The text of the status manipulation is below (see Appendix 2):

- **Higher-status.** Jennifer (Steve) is at a higher level than you in the firm. Jennifer (Steve) is performing well. You have had some professional and social interaction with Jennifer (Steve).

or

- **Equal-status.** Jennifer (Steve) is at the same level as you in the firm. Jennifer (Steve) is performing well. You have had some professional and social interaction with Jennifer (Steve).

**Dependent Measures**
**Likelihood of Career-related Advice-seeking.** The dependent variable, called likelihood of career-related advice-seeking, is a composite measure of the advice-seeker’s likelihood to seek career-related advice from the potential advice-giver. Likelihood of career-related advice-seeking was derived from the average score, each measured on a Likert Scale of 1 to 7, of four items which were asked after the participant read the vignette and description of Jennifer or Steve. The items were: (a) I am very likely to approach Jennifer (Steve) for advice in my current situation, (b) Jennifer (Steve) is likely to be extremely helpful in my current situation, (c) I very much want Jennifer’s (Steve)’s advice about my current situation, and (d) I am very likely to ask Jennifer (Steve) for advice in my current situation. A principal component analysis was performed which determined that all four items comprising the dependent variable, likelihood of career-related advice-seeking, loaded on one factor, each above the 0.85 level. The reliability of the scale (Cronbach’s Alpha) is 0.90.

**Likelihood of Gender-based Homophily when Advice-seeking.** The dependent variable, called likelihood of gender-based homophily when advice-seeking, is a one-item dichotomous measure of the advice-seeker’s likelihood to seek career-related advice from either a same-sex advice-giver or an opposite sex advice-giver. The question to participants was, “In your current situation, who are you more likely to seek advice from?” This variable was a forced choice item where respondents had to choose either Steve or Jennifer. The variable is derived from the score of this single item where 1 = male advice-giver and 2 = female advice-giver.

**Influence Perception of Advice-giver.** The dependent variable, called influence perception, is a one-item dichotomous measure of the advice-seeker’s perception of who
has more influence, Steve (male advice-giver) or Jennifer (female advice-giver). The question to participants was, “According to you, who has more influence?” This variable was a forced choice item where respondents had to choose either Steve or Jennifer. The variable is derived from the score of this single item where 1 = male advice-giver and 2 = female advice-giver.

**Independent Measures**

*Gender of Participant/Advice-seeker.* The sex of every participant was reported in the demographics section of the online survey instrument.

*Status of condition.* Status of the condition was manipulated by the brief descriptions of the potential advice-givers, activated by the phrase “is at a higher level than you in the firm” or “is at the same level as you in the firm”. The formal position an individual holds within an organizational hierarchy is an example of a achieved status characteristic that is often related to conscious status judgments and often reflects an employee’s contribution, value, and overall competence level because of the inherent inequality created in a hierarchy of formal positions (Berger, Fisek, Norman, & Zelditch, 1977; Hollander, 1958; Tushman & Romanelli, 1983; Huberman, Lock & Onculer, 2004). The text of the status manipulation is below:

*High status.* Jennifer (Steve) is at a higher level than you in the firm. Jennifer (Steve) is performing well. You have had some professional and social interaction with Jennifer (Steve).

or

*Equal status.* Jennifer (Steve) is at the same level as you in the firm. Jennifer (Steve) is performing well. You have had some professional and social interaction with Jennifer (Steve).

*Interaction of Status of Advice-giver and Gender of Participant/Advice-seeker.* The status of the advice-giver was manipulated by the phrase “is at a higher level than you in
Results

Manipulation check

In order to determine if participants viewed the higher status and equal status conditions differently, I examined the differences in the status (see Figure 2.1) using a composite measure of the advice-seeker’s perception of status of the potential advice-giver. This status scale (Tiedens, 2001) is a well-known scale made up of four items. Status was derived from the average score, each measured on a Likert Scale of 1 to 7, of four items which were asked after the participant read the vignette and description of Jennifer or Steve. The items were: (a) Jennifer (Steve) is very high status in the firm, (b) Jennifer (Steve) has a lot of power in the firm, (c) Jennifer (Steve) is very independent in the firm, and (d) Jennifer (Steve) is highly ranked in the firm. A principal component analysis was performed which determined that all four items comprising the independent variable, status, loaded on one factor, each above the 0.86 level. The reliability of the scale (Cronbach’s Alpha) is 0.92. As expected, participants rated higher level advice-givers (M = 4.66) significantly higher on the status score than equal level advice-givers (M = 3.16), \( F(1, 174) = 116.6, p < .001 \). Results of this manipulation check support the idea that participants perceived potential advice-givers appropriately in high and low status conditions.

[INSERT FIGURE 2.1 ABOUT HERE]

In order to determine if and how participants gender-stereotyped the male and female advice-givers, a short version of the Bem Sex Role Inventory (BSRI) consisting of...
14 items measuring perceived masculinity and femininity of the advice-givers was collected using a Likert Scale of 1 to 7. Sample items for femininity included “warm” and “understanding,” whereas sample items for masculinity included “dominant” and “aggressive.” To determine if the manipulation of sex of the advice-giver was perceived appropriately by the participants, I examined the perceived masculinity and femininity scores of the advice-givers (see Figures 2.2 & 2.3). Female advice-givers scored significantly higher on the BSRI for perceived femininity ($M = 4.50$) than male advice-givers ($M = 3.87$), $F (1, 166) = 88.47, p < .001$. Male advice-givers scored significantly higher on the BSRI for perceived masculinity ($M = 5.22$) than female advice-givers ($M = 4.88$), $F (1, 164) =33.37, p < .001$. Results of this manipulation check support the idea that participants perceived potential advice-givers as relatively more feminine in the female conditions and relatively more masculine in the male conditions.

[INSERT FIGURE 2.2 AND FIGURE 2.3 ABOUT HERE]

**Data Analysis**

Several models using analysis of variance (ANOVA) were examined, modeling main effects and two-way interactions. In addition, in order to understand the underlying mechanisms driving two-way interaction effects, I conducted planned contrasts in line with my hypotheses using the Fisher’s least significant difference test (significance level set at $p < .05$) (Heilman & Haynes, 2005). I also examined dichotomous variables of likelihood of seeking advice and perception of influence to determine gender-based homophily effects.

*Status.* I hypothesized (H1) that both men and women are more likely to seek advice from higher status others than from equal status others. In order to test this hypothesis, the
main effect of status on the likelihood of advice-seeking was analyzed (see Table 2.1; see Figure 2.4) using a planned contrast. It was found that men and women are significantly more likely to seek advice from higher status others (M = 5.56) than from equal status others (M = 4.32), t (140) = 7.558, p < .001, thus supporting Hypothesis 1. Therefore, as hypothesized, status seems to be an important factor for both men and women when seeking career advice and they tend to seek it from higher status others.

[INSERT TABLE 2.1 AND FIGURE 2.4 ABOUT HERE]

Status and gender. I hypothesized that when seeking career-related advice from individuals at a higher organizational level (H2a) and from individuals at an equal organizational level (H2b), men are more likely to approach men than women. In order to test these hypotheses, the two-way interaction between the status of the advice-giver and the gender of the advice-seeker was analyzed. There is a significant interaction effect of the combination of the status of the advice-giver and the gender of the advice-seeker on the advice-giver’s likelihood in seeking advice from a male advice-giver vs. a female advice-giver, F (1, 169) = 4.802, p = .030 (see Table 2.3). Thus, the interaction between status and gender seems to be an important factor, but it needs to be teased apart in order to understand how exactly it affects likelihood of advice-seeking. Specifically, upon further analysis of the two-way interaction between the status of advice-giver and the gender of participant (see Table 2.2 for Means; see Figures 2.5 & 2.6), I find that in the higher status condition (H2a), men are equally as likely to seek advice from a higher status female advice-giver as from a higher status male advice-giver (M = 1.53, where 1 = higher male advice-giver and 2 = higher female advice giver). Conversely, in the equal status condition (H2b), men are 68% more likely to approach an equal status male for
advice (M = 1.32, where 1 = equal male advice-giver and 2 = equal female advice-giver) than an equal status female. These results indicate that men do not have a strong preference between men and women when they are both in a higher status position, whereas men strongly prefer approaching men more than women when they are both in an equal status position. Thus, these findings suggest that the resources provided by higher status outweigh the desires for gender-based homophily for men.

In contrast, and as suggested by H3a, women are more likely to seek advice from a higher status female advice-giver than from a higher status male (M = 1.75, where 1 = equal male advice-giver and 2 = equal female advice-giver; i.e., 75% chose women). Likewise as suggested by H3b, women are also more likely to seek advice from an equal status female advice-giver than from an equal status male advice-giver (M = 1.80, where 1 = equal male advice-giver and 2 = equal female advice-giver; i.e. 80% chose women). These results suggest that women have a strong preference for gender-based homophily, choosing women over men within the high and equal status conditions. One explanation for this finding is that people who are in the minority, like women in management levels of many organizations, are more likely to seek out and interact with others based on a salient characteristic, such as gender (Reagans, 2005).

[INSERT TABLE 2.2, TABLE 2.3, FIGURE 2.5, AND FIGURE 2.6]

Discussion

In Study 1, both male and female participants were more likely to seek career-related advice from higher-level advice-givers than equal-level advice-givers. These findings provide support for the idea that both men and women believe that approaching higher-status others, regardless of gender, who are privy to valuable resources and
rewards like industry and firm-based knowledge and relationships with senior level management, will help them gain access to more resources than if they were to approach equal-status advice-givers. For both men and women, willingness to approach higher status others for advice may be referred to as a positive socioemotional behavior (Ridgeway & Johnson, 1990) because lower-status individuals are deferring to higher-status individuals in their quest for career advice. This deference is a demonstration of acceptance of the higher-status individual’s place in the hierarchy, and acceptance from lower-status individuals promotes feelings of value and importance for higher-status individuals. In turn, higher-status individuals are likely to act positively in order to maintain their feelings of justification and importance. Therefore, lower-status individuals’ positive behavior influences positive behavior of higher-status individuals creating a virtuous cycle (Ridgeway & Johnson, 1990). For lower-status individuals, this positive behavior cycle may be a good tactic for promoting workplace success.

To reiterate, Study 1 confirms the already well-established finding that men are status-seeking and, therefore, more likely to approach higher-status others than equal-status others for valuable resources such as career-related advice. More interestingly, however, this study suggests that women are also willing to approach higher status others for valuable resources more so than equal-status others. While this finding may be seem intuitive, it is a valuable contribution to the gender literature stream because it is a direct test of preferences for women whereas past field research concerning women’s network formation is based on inference about preferences (Ibarra, 1992). Furthermore, this preference for women that they can be status-seeking is either debatable in or contradictory to past research. As an example, women’s tendencies that form in the
development of childhood friendships has demonstrated that girls display a particular affinity for dyads, or one-on-one interactions where intimate conversation is important and meaningful (Eder & Hallinan, 1978; Van Brunschot, Zarbatany, & Strang, 1993). Dyadic, intimate relationships may imply more of an equal status playing field where giving and receiving is relatively reciprocal and even. In conclusion, this study establishes a direct preference that not only men but also women are more likely to approach higher status others more than equal status others when seeking career-related advice, an important preference that may not have been as conclusive in past studies.

The interaction between status and gender-based homophily in this study yielded both interesting and unexpected findings. As expected, women were more likely to approach women than men for career-related advice in both the higher-status and equal-status conditions. Women’s strong preference for gender-based homophily whether higher status or equal status is suggestive of the idea that the mechanism driving gender homophily for women is more relational than status driven. Otherwise, women would have preferred men in the higher-status condition based on the ascribed status characteristic of being male which broadly signals higher levels of competence over women (Fiske et. al., 2002). Furthermore, this finding supports the idea that people who are in the minority, like women in management levels of many organizations, are more likely to seek out and interact with others based on a salient characteristic, such as gender (Reagans, 2005).

Whereas men were more likely to approach men for career-related advice in the equal-status condition, men were just as likely to approach women as they were to approach men in the higher-status condition. Gender-based homophily played a role in
the equal-status condition where men may have been more comfortable approaching men than women, but in the higher status condition, men did not seem to care as much about gender homophily as they did about sheer status. This finding is contrary to past research that claims when status is differentiated by sex, men and women are driven toward and assessed by “sex-based ideals” (Berdahl, 2007), which by in large are relatively in line with male and female gender stereotypes (Bergen & Williams, 1991; Buss, 1989; Connell, 1995; Eagly, 1987; Fiske, Cuddy, Glick & Xu, 2002; Williams & Best, 1990). Consequently, when individuals assess the social status for men, men are compared to the male gender stereotype which is based on an assessment of masculinity, or attributes such as workplace success and control (Berdahl, 2007; Bem, 1978; Cuddy, Fiske, & Glick, 2004; Fiske et al., 2002; Prentice & Carranza, 2002). Women, likewise, are compared to the female gender stereotype which is based on an assessment of femininity including warmth and compassion (Berdahl 2007; Bem, 1978; Cuddy, Fiske, & Glick, 2004; Fiske et al., 2002; Prentice & Carranza, 2002). If true, even higher-status women in the workplace, who are compared against the characteristics representative of the female gender stereotype, may be subject to a low status rating because the female gender stereotype typically opposes those characteristics, like competitive and aggressive, often required to garner career success. Men in the workplace are inherently in a more advantageous position than women because men who are assessed by others against the male gender stereotype are typically more in line, allowing them to receive a higher status rating. However, in this study, results indicate that men may not always engage in gender stereotyping and may be more willing to seek advice from higher-status women than previously expected.
One of the limitations to Study 1 is that the sample is derived from a student-based population with limited work experience. To address this limitation, the next study (Study 2), which is a replication of this study, uses a population of working lawyers as its sample. Working lawyers embedded in today’s workforce may offer a more realistic perspective when it comes to making network choices when seeking career-related advice.

**STUDY 2**

*Participants and Design*

Participants consisted of 53 lawyers based throughout the United States who had gathered for an annual law conference at a large northeastern university. The sample was made up of 33 males and 20 females who ranged in age from 23 to 62 years with a Mean age of 33.9 years. The sample consisted of a broad range of lawyers in terms of their current rank in their respective law firms with 26.2% at the Junior level; 42.9% at the Associate level; 9.5% at the V.P./Senior Manager level; 2.4% at the Executive Level; and 19.0% at the Senior Executive level. This study employed a mixed model design with 2 between subjects factors and one within subjects factor, or a 2 (participant gender or advice-seeker: male vs. female) x 2 (advice-giver status: higher than vs. equal to participant) between subjects factors, and, in addition, a within subjects factor that had two levels, (advice-giver gender: male vs. female).

*Materials and Procedure*

Participants were randomly given one of two versions of a paper and pencil survey instrument (representing four experimental conditions) during a law conference. Participants were directed to complete the survey and turn it in before the end of the three-day conference. The directions in the survey instrument as well as the vignette
were exactly the same as in Study 1. However, because this survey was administered with paper and pencil unlike in Study 1, there was no control over the participant going back and changing answers regarding the first potential advice-giver once they had begun answering questions about the second potential advice-giver.

**Experimental manipulations**

*Sex of advice-giver.* (Same as in Study 1.)

*Status of advice-giver.* (Same as in Study 1.)

**Dependent Measures**

*Likelihood of Career-related Advice-seeking.* The dependent variable, called likelihood of career-related advice-seeking, is a composite measure of the advice-seeker’s likelihood to seek career-related advice from the potential advice-giver. Likelihood of career-related advice-seeking was derived from the average score, each measured on a Likert Scale of 1 to 7, of four items which were asked after the participant read the vignette and description of Jennifer or Steve. The items were: (a) I am very likely to approach Jennifer (Steve) for advice in my current situation, (b) Jennifer (Steve) is likely to be extremely helpful in my current situation, (c) I very much want Jennifer’s (Steve)’s advice about my current situation, and (d) I am very likely to ask Jennifer (Steve) for advice in my current situation. A principal component analysis was performed which determined that all four items comprising the dependent variable, likelihood of career-related advice-seeking, loaded on one factor, each above the 0.90 level. The reliability of the scale (Cronbach’s Alpha) is 0.93.

*Likelihood of Gender-based Homophily when Advice-seeking.* (Same as in Study 1.)

*Influence Perception of Advice-giver.* (Same as in Study 1.)
Independent Measures

*Gender of Participant/Advice-seeker.* (Same as in Study 1)

*Status of condition.* (Same as in Study 1)

*Interaction of Status of Advice-giver and Gender of Participant/Advice-seeker.*

(Same as in Study 1)

Results

*Manipulation check*

In order to determine if participants viewed the higher status and equal status conditions differently, I examined the differences in status (see Figure 2.7) using a composite measure of the advice-seeker’s perception of status of the potential advice-giver. This status scale (Tiedens, 2001) is a well-known scale made up of four items. Status was derived from the average score, each measured on a Likert Scale of 1 to 7, of four items which were asked after the participant read the vignette and description of Jennifer or Steve. The items were: (a) Jennifer (Steve) is very high status in the firm, (b) Jennifer (Steve) has a lot of power in the firm, (c) Jennifer (Steve) is very independent in the firm, and (d) Jennifer (Steve) is highly ranked in the firm. A principal component analysis was performed which determined that all four items comprising the independent variable, status, loaded on one factor, each above the 0.92 level. The reliability of the scale (Cronbach’s Alpha) is 0.95. As expected, participants rated higher-level advice-givers (M = 4.58) significantly higher on the status score than equal-level advice-givers (M = 3.22), $F (1, 52) = 24.1, p < .001$. Results of this manipulation check support the idea that participants perceived potential advice-givers appropriately in high and low status conditions.
In order to determine if and how participants gender-stereotyped the male and female advice-givers, a short version of the Bem Sex Role Inventory (BSRI) consisting of 14 items measuring perceived masculinity and femininity of the advice-givers was collected using a Likert Scale of 1 to 7. Sample items for femininity included “warm” and “understanding,” whereas sample items for masculinity included “dominant” and “aggressive.” To determine if the manipulation of sex of the advice-giver was perceived appropriately by the participants, I examined the perceived masculinity and femininity scores of the advice-givers (see Figures 2.8 & 2.9). Female advice-givers scored significantly higher on the BSRI for perceived femininity ($M = 4.48$) than male advice-givers ($M = 3.86$), $F(1, 50) = 40.73$, $p < .001$. Male advice-givers scored significantly higher on the BSRI for perceived masculinity ($M = 5.12$) than female advice-givers ($M = 4.73$), $F(1, 50) = 24.19$, $p < .001$. Results of this manipulation check support the idea that participants perceived potential advice-givers as relatively more feminine in the female conditions and relatively more masculine in the male conditions.

Data Analysis

Several models using analysis of variance (ANOVA) were examined, modeling main effects and two-way interactions. In addition, in order to understand the underlying mechanisms driving two-way interaction effects, I conducted planned contrasts in line with my hypotheses using the Fisher’s least significant difference test (significance level set at $p < .05$) (Heilman & Haynes, 2005). I also examined dichotomous variables of
likelihood of seeking advice and perception of influence to determine gender-based homophily effects.

**Status.** I hypothesized (H1) that both men and women are more likely to seek advice from higher status others than from equal status others. In order to test this hypothesis, the main effect of status on the likelihood of advice-seeking was analyzed (see Tables 2.4; see Figure 2.10) using a planned contrast. It was found that men and women are significantly more likely to seek advice from higher status others ($M = 5.28$) than from equal status others ($M = 4.18$), $t(48) = 3.023, p = .004$, thus supporting Hypothesis 1. Therefore, as hypothesized, status seems to be an important factor for both men and women when seeking career advice, and they tend to seek it from higher status others.

[INSERT TABLES 2.4 AND FIGURE 2.10 HERE]

**Status and gender.** I hypothesized that when seeking career-related advice from individuals at a higher organizational level (H2a) and from individuals at an equal organizational level (H2b), women are more likely to approach women than men. In order to test these hypotheses, the two-way interaction between the status of the advice-giver and the gender of the advice-seeker was analyzed (see Table 2.6). There is not a significant interaction effect of the combination of the status of the advice-giver and the gender of the advice-seeker on the advice-giver’s likelihood in seeking advice from a male advice-giver vs. a female advice-giver, $F (1, 53) = 0.45, p = .505$ (See Table 2.6). However, the sample size in each condition is relatively small and, therefore, may not have the statistical power for a significant interaction effect.

Upon further analysis of the two-way interaction between status of advice-giver and gender of participant concerning the gender-based homophily hypotheses (H2 and
H3) (see Table 2.5 for Means), I find that men are more likely to seek advice from a higher status male advice-giver than a higher status female advice-giver (M = 1.27, where 1 = higher male advice-giver and 2 = higher female advice giver; thus, 73% choose the male advice giver). Likewise, men are more likely to seek advice from an equal status male advice-giver than an equal status female advice-giver (M = 1.31, where 1 = higher male advice-giver and 2 = higher female advice giver; thus 69% choose the male advice giver). Unlike Study 1, these results suggest that men seem to have a strong preference for gender-based homophily, in both the high status and equal status conditions.

Consistent with study 1, women are more likely to seek advice from a higher status female advice-giver than from a higher status male advice-giver (M = 1.88, where 1 = equal male advice-giver and 2 = equal female advice-giver; 88% choose a female giver). Similarly women are more likely to seek advice from an equal status female advice-giver than from an equal status male advice-giver (M = 1.71, where 1 = equal male advice-giver and 2 = equal female advice-giver; 71% choose the female advice giver). These results suggest that women have strong preference for gender-based homophily, in both the high and equal status conditions. In this sample of lawyers, and in contrast to Study 1 where men were likely to approach either men or women in the high status condition, H2 and H3 are supported in that both men and women favor gender-based homophily when seeking career advice in both the higher and equal status conditions.

INSERT TABLES 2.5 & 2.6 AND FIGURES 2.11 & 2.12

Discussion
Consistent with Study 1, both male and female participants were more likely to seek career-related advice from higher-level advice-givers than equal-level advice-givers. These findings, replicated from Study 1, further establish the direct preference, as opposed to inference about preferences, that men and women are more likely to approach higher-status others than equal-status for valuable resources such as career-related advice.

The interaction between status and gender in Study 2 yielded both similar and different results from Study 1. As expected, and consistent with Study 1, women were more likely to approach women than men for career-related advice in both the higher-status and equal-status conditions. Also as expected, men were more likely to approach men for career-related advice in the equal-status condition, but, unlike in Study 1, men were more likely to approach men for career-related advice in the higher-status condition. Therefore, in this study, gender-based homophily played a role in both the equal-status and higher-status conditions. However, it is difficult to differentiate the status mechanism from the relational mechanism for gender-based homophily. Assuming that gender-based homophily in Study 2 was driven by a status mechanism more so than a relational mechanism, these findings support past research that claims when status is differentiated by sex, men and women are driven toward and assessed by “sex-based ideals” (Berdahl, 2007), which by in large are relatively in line with male and female gender stereotypes (Bergen & Williams, 1991; Buss, 1989; Connell, 1995; Eagly, 1987; Fiske, Cuddy, Glick & Xu, 2002; Williams & Best, 1990). If the status mechanism is at work, results support the idea that men engage in gender stereotyping causing them to favor men over women when seeking career-related advice.
However, in this sample of working lawyers, the relational mechanism could have also played a role in men’s preferences because in organizations that are disproportionately male, particularly at the senior level like in law firms, individuals’ interaction patterns often show a tendency toward gender-based homophily based on availability and not choice (Kossinets & Watts, 2009, p. 407). Even though this experiment was designed to understand choice homophily which is based on personal preferences (McPherson & Smith-Lovin, 1987), men may have acted as if they were in their respective organizations and displayed a pattern of induced homophily which is based on structural availability (McPherson & Smith-Lovin, 1987). Another piece of anecdotal evidence that could indicate favoritism toward the relational mechanism over the status mechanism is when participants were asked the question, “According to you, who has more influence Jennifer or Steve?”, male participants rated Steve and Jennifer as equally influential in both the higher-status and equal-status conditions (see Table 2.7 and Table 2.8). This finding suggests that men view women just as competent as men and, therefore, contradicts the gender as a status mechanism argument which is the belief then men are universally more competent than women. This finding is encouraging for women in the workplace who often struggle to prove their competence to other men even after they have reached upper-level management.

INSERT TABLE 2.7 AND TABLE 2.8

General Discussion

The set of studies in this paper investigated how status alone and the interaction between status and gender-based homophily affect men’s and women’s network preferences in the workplace when seeking career-related advice. Whereas past studies
concerning gender differences in network preferences are often conducted in the field making it difficult to untangle choice from availability, this set of studies used an experimental design where ideal conditions could be constructed in order to hone in on choice without the constraints of organizational composition, or availability. Two studies tested the same hypotheses that men and women prefer seeking career-related advice from higher status others more than equal status others, and that both men and women prefer seeking advice from same-sex others more than opposite-sex others in both the higher and equal-status conditions. Both studies confirmed the first hypothesis, that men and women, in an effort to gain access to valuable resources, are more likely to seek advice from higher status others more than equal status others. While this was not a surprising finding for men, it was an important establishment for women from both theoretical and practical standpoints. Theoretically, whereas past studies of women’s interaction patterns indicate favoritism toward intimacy implying a preference toward equal-status relationships, these studies contradict that inference and make a case for status-seeking women. Practically, this finding proves that women are willing to reach up in the organizational hierarchy to gain the resources and advantages needed for career success.

In the first study, the second hypothesis (H2a), that women prefer women more than men in both the higher- and equal- status conditions, was also confirmed. This finding makes a strong case that women value gender-based homophily no matter the status, and it is most likely driven by a relational mechanism versus a status mechanism. Otherwise, women would have favored men more than women in the higher-status condition. For men (H2b), the second hypothesis that men would prefer men in both the
higher- and equal-status condition was confirmed for the equal status condition, but not confirmed for the higher-status condition. This was an unexpected and interesting finding because it suggests that men want to connect with men in the equal-status condition (gender-based homophily), but in the higher status condition they do not have a strong preference for men or for women making a case for men that they only care about status. From a practical point of view, the fact that men are willing to approach higher status women for career advice is encouraging for women in upper-level management who sometimes find it challenging to mentor men. Another implication of this finding is that the status mechanism was most likely cued by the achieved status characteristic of firm rank and not the ascribed status characteristic of gender, which, as already mentioned, points to men as being more competent than women. The fact that men in the first experiment cued into firm rank as a status signal without regard to gender is an important step toward eliminating gender bias in the workplace.

The second study, where only the sample population (working lawyers) differed, yielded slightly different results for the second hypothesis concerning status and gender-based homophily. In both the equal and higher-status conditions, men were more likely to approach men than women. While this confirmed the second hypothesis of the interaction between status and gender-based homophily, it was a different result from the first study, and, therefore, raises interesting questions around the perception of higher status women across the two sample populations. One explanation that could account for differing results between the two studies is that undergraduate students may view the world with an impartial and fair-minded lens whereas working lawyers may be more influenced by gender as a status characteristic given their experiences in the workplace.
Another explanation is that lawyers may have been more prone to act as if they were in their respective law firms which are most likely heavily represented by men in the upper levels of the hierarchy.

Taken together, this research establishes that, like men, women are status-seeking when it comes to seeking career-related advice. Second, it demonstrates that women prefer connecting with other women no matter the status. And, third, it is suggestive that men may be willing to approach higher status women for career-related advice, but this idea needs further testing.

Contributions

This study has both theoretical and methodological contributions in the way it systematically examined the effect of status and the interaction effect of status and gender-based homophily on men’s and women’s network preferences. This study adds to the existing literature on gender differences in personal networks, but it examines men’s and women’s preferences in a controlled laboratory setting as opposed to examining preferences often constrained by availability in a field setting. From a theoretical perspective, this is an important contribution as it allows the disentangling of differential constraints placed on men and women by workplace composition from their potential behavior if positions in organizations were more equally distributed across gender.

Methodologically, not only was this network study performed in the lab where organizational composition constraints were eliminated and variables of interest were manipulated, but employing the vignette technique allowed the incorporation of a realistic work situation and provided the exact same work situation to both men and women which helped to distinguish between preference and opportunity more clearly.
Limitations and Future directions

The current study has a number of potential limitations. First, brevity and the lack of individual information in the descriptions of potential advice-givers were purposeful enabling subjects to react to only a few status cues—the ascribed status characteristic of gender or the achieved status characteristic of firm rank. However, oversimplified descriptions of advice-givers may have made it difficult for subjects to imagine whom they would approach for advice. The organizational context of the vignette was a Wall Street investment bank, widely known to be male-dominated, which may have skewed gender preferences. However, this context is consistent with many organizational settings that are dominated by men in leadership positions (Roth, 2004). Future research is needed to identify whether there are conditions under which gender network preferences change, for example, in a more gender-neutral or female-dominated organizational environment. The mechanism by which men engage in gender-based homophily, a status mechanism versus a relational mechanism, was difficult to pinpoint, and if it could be pinpointed results of these studies could have been more fully explained. Now that these studies have provided convincing evidence that higher-status men and women are more likely to be approached than equal-status men and women, one direction for future research could be to add more variables around the specific type of relationship higher-status others have with junior men and women in the workplace and how that might affect likelihood in seeking career-related advice.

Conclusion

This set of studies raises important theoretical and practical questions around the higher-status woman because of some evidence that shows men’s willingness to seek career-
related advice from higher-status women, and more convincing evidence that women significantly prefer higher-status women more than men. Theoretically, what else can we learn about the high status woman that makes her more or less approachable to junior men and women? Practically, the high-status woman seems to lack presence in the workplace, particularly male-dominated firms—what can be done to promote and retain more high-status women?
Chapter Three: Does it Matter if She’s Nice? The influence of gender and relationship type on men’s and women’s network preferences

Introduction

Networks, defined as informal relationships that connect individuals and groups of individuals, persist in organizations. These powerful networks in organizations are beneficial for many reasons including increased motivation, higher performance (e.g. Hackman & Oldham, 1980; Spreitzer, 1996), and promotion to upper-management levels (Brass, 1985). Hence, establishing personal networks in the workplace has been shown to be important for individual career success and, in particular, for women’s career advancement (Morrison, Van Velsor & White, 1987; Davies-Netzley, 1998). However, organizational research provides evidence that men and women differ in the structure of personal networks, as well as in the rewards attained from personal networks.

One of the reasons that networks may affect women’s careers differently than men’s careers is because women’s networks are structurally distinct from men’s networks (Ibarra 1992, 1993, 1995). One situational explanation addressing gender differences in network structure suggested by prior research is that women have less access to important networks compared to men (Kanter, 1977; Harlan & Weiss, 1982; Ragins & Sundstrom, 1990). Differential access is considered a structural constraint because it is most likely caused by organizational barriers such as work group composition (Brass, 1985) or rank (Ibarra, 1992). Other studies (Ibarra, 1993; Ibarra, 1997) recognize that women and men may choose to form and maintain different types of relationships leading to overall gender differences in network structure. For instance, it seems as though men often have a greater number of instrumental ties, relationships that provide job-related resources, in
their networks than women, while women have a greater number of expressive ties, relationships that provide emotional and social support, in their networks compared to men (Ibarra, 1993; Ibarra, 1997). Further compounding women’s network disadvantage, research suggests that women may reap fewer network rewards, such as advantageous information or endorsement from senior managers, than men (Brass, 1985; Morrison & Von Glinow, 1990; Smith-Lovin & McPherson, 1993; Belliveau, 2005).

While prior research has identified key gender differences in network structure and network rewards, few studies have delved into why men and women have different networks and how these disparate networks lead to varying levels of network rewards. It is possible that these different networks result as a consequence of individuals’ preferences to form and maintain certain types of relationships. For instance, Ibarra’s (1993, 1997) findings that women have more expressive, or supportive, relationships while men tend to form a greater number of instrumental relationships may be a consequence of gender preferences in network formation, or what I will refer to as network preferences. Studying preferences is important because they inform us about what types of networks people would likely build free from organizational constraints. Such information is helpful in guiding us as organizational composition changes, for instance, due to changes in workforce diversity. Thus, in a controlled laboratory experiment, this paper attempts to explain gender-based differences in networks through a framework of network preferences.

**Gender Differences in Networks**

Gender differences in networks have been explained by both structural and dispositional perspectives. The dispositional perspective claims that because men and
women are inherently distinct, they choose to associate with different others. For example, a number of studies have found that women are more likely to foster close ties with family members, who provide support and cooperation, as compared to men (Miller, 1976; Chodorow, 1978; Gilligan, 1982). Men, on the other hand, tend to form more ties that provide instrumental resources than women (Ibarra, 1992). Moreover, it has been found that men tend to seek friendship from those men who also provide access to organizational resources. Such ties are called multiplex because they provide multiple resources, and in the context of this paper, are defined as exchanging both friendship and professional resources (Ibarra, 1992). Thus, men often have more multiplex ties than women (Ibarra, 1992). Ibarra (1997) indirectly examined network preferences and found that high potential women had significantly more same-sex career and information ties than non-high potential women. Given that both high potential and non-high potential women formed their networks in the same structural context, Ibarra (1997, p. 96) concluded that the variance may be viewed as evidence of choice rather than induced homophily. This conclusion, while plausible, is based on inference about preferences, and not based on a direct test of preferences.

The structural perspective claims that contextual factors and boundaries explain the reasons why men and women choose to form different types of associations (Fischer & Oliker, 1983). Particularly if the tendency for women to build relationships with other women and for minorities to build relationships with other minorities exists, a phenomenon called homophily (Rogers and Kincaid, 1981), Ibarra (1993) suggests that structural variables like organizational composition, or the fact that women and minorities are often less likely than white men to hold high status positions in
organizations, may limit women’s ability to create powerful social networks, whereas men are not as likely to face these same constraints. Hence, if the rationale holds true, women will have a narrower range of network choices than men (ties with equal or lower status others for women, compared to ties with lower, equal or higher status others for men). This proposition was illustrated by Belliveau (2005) who discovered an institutional sex composition effect: women graduating from single-sex colleges received significantly lower salary offers than women from comparable coeducational schools. This may have been because women from single-sex colleges were more likely to connect with other women, and those women were generally not as well-placed in the labor market as men (Belliveau, 2005). Earlier work by Lin (1999), which showed that women’s networks were less effective than men’s networks in both attaining jobs and becoming privy to maximum pay grades in professions, supports Belliveau’s (2005) finding. Belliveau’s (2005) study also demonstrates that instrumental ties with men may be more valuable than instrumental ties with women because individuals receive more valuable instrumental rewards, such as access to important information (Mehra, Kilduff, & Brass, 1998), from ties with men than from ties with women. Furthermore, this study supports the structural perspective that organizational composition frames an individual’s opportunity to connect with others (Belliveau, 2005).

Network Structure and Network Preferences

Network structure is a static and generalized view of an individual's total network encompassing the entire population of an individual’s ties. The majority of recent studies on gender and networks focus on network structure differences which are generated using cross-sectional network methods. The primary tool is called a sociometric questionnaire.
used to generate an individual’s network structure which captures individuals’ organizational relationships along a variety of dimensions at a specific point in time. Sociometric questions are often divided by distinct boundaries which help to categorize an individual’s network map into sub-networks. A potential drawback to network structure studies as they pertain to gender differences is that these studies are in the context of an organization which on one hand is favorable because it provides a real world setting but, on the other hand, is difficult because it entangles structural constraints, such as organizational composition, with personal preferences. Therefore, it is difficult to determine whether an individual’s network structure is induced, chosen, or results from some combination of the structure and preference (McPherson & Smith-Lovin, 1987). Another limitation to network structure studies is that they do not place the participant in a specific situation, so the network, as already mentioned, is both static and over-generalized making it difficult to hone in on the gender differences that exist in network structures.

Network preferences are the choices individuals make regarding with whom to form connections with, given an ideal work setting in which both male and female others are available to connect with at all levels of the organization. In this study, an ideal work setting is constructed in the laboratory in order to clearly identify from whom men and women prefer seeking advice when given the exact same career decision problem, where individuals seeking advice are referred to as advice-seekers and individuals who may be approached for advice are referred to as advice-givers.

As previously mentioned, it has been found that men tend to have more same-sex multiplex ties than women (Ibarra, 1992), but it is not clear whether this finding is a
result of preference (dispositional perspective) or availability (structural perspective), and thus, the impetus of this paper. Using a controlled experiment, free from organizational constraints, that makes same-sex multiplex ties available to both men and women, the first question I examine in this paper is: (a) are there still differences in men’s and women’s preferences for multiplex ties? However, when same-sex multiplex ties are not available, a valid concern in today’s workplace, what is the next most preferred combination of relationship-type and gender for men and for women? Thus, the second question I examine in this paper is: (b) when same-sex multiplex ties are not available to both men and women, are there differences in whom men and women are most likely to approach next? By focusing on “next preferences”, or advice-givers who are next most likely to be approached by men and women after same-sex multiplex ties, relationship type and gender-based homophily may be untangled from each other in a way that reveals gender differences in network preferences.

**Gender and Relationship Type**

**Gender-based Homophily**

Homophily is the propensity of individuals to interact with similar others, where similarity is defined as some common group identity or affiliation such as race, gender, or education (Ibarra, 1992; Rogers and Kincaid, 1981). A number of possible mechanisms may explain individuals’ preferences for homophilous ties. For both men and women, the similarity-attraction theory applies which posits that individuals are attracted to others based on likeness (e.g. Byrne, 1971; Festinger, 1957; Heider, 1958). As gender is one of the most prevalent characteristics by which we organize ourselves, distinguish ourselves, confer status, and allocate societal functions (Berdahl, 2007, p. 12), seeking out others of
the same gender is a common experience. Past research suggests that gender-based homophily is one of the most prevalent types of homophily, particularly in organizational settings (Ibarra, 1992; Brass, 1985).

Another possible explanation for gender-based homophily is the operation of an automatic in-group bias (Rudman & Goodwin, 2004) which drives individuals to give preferential treatment to and favorable judgments of members in their own group as opposed to members of the out-group, who are less favored. Bias toward others who are in one’s in-group is a phenomenon that has been convincingly demonstrated even when the identifier is as simple as a team color (Sherif & Sherif, 1988; Tajfel & Turner, 1986). Presumably, identification with the in-group based on one’s gender may cause an even stronger sense of bias toward in-group members.

For men and women, the status of their particular in-group (though different) is likely to activate in-group bias driving the tendency toward gender-based homophily. Thus, men who often view themselves as part of the dominant, high-status group and women as part of the less powerful, low-status group prefer approaching others in their own group— i.e. men. Even when women appear to be in a higher status position because of organizational hierarchy, men may still recognize other men as more legitimate than women because men are often perceived as more influential than their female counterparts (Fiske et. al., 2006).

Interacting with similar others, particularly when attraction is based on a salient social characteristic such as gender, creates a type of bond which may facilitate communication and promote trust (Ibarra, 1992, p. 423). Particularly in situations that require advice-seeking where the advice-seeker is inherently placed in a less powerful
and deferential position, the desire for easy communication and trust, or the tendency toward gender-based homophily, may be even more pronounced. Advice-seekers may consider themselves to be more vulnerable than usual because they are entering an exchange where they assume little to no power compared to the higher-status advice-giver resulting in a higher probability of gender-based homophily between the advice-seeker and advice-giver. Therefore, I hypothesize:

**Hypothesis 1 (H1):** Men and women prefer seeking career-related advice from same-sex others more than opposite-sex others.

**Relationship Type: Instrumental or Multiplex**

In the network literature, a relationship is characterized based on the predominant type of resources exchanged between two individuals. For example, in the workplace the types of resources that are commonly exchanged are broadly categorized into three relationship types: instrumental, expressive and multiplex. *Instrumental* ties involve the exchange of job-related resources which may include valuable information, expertise, professional advice, political access, material sources, career direction guidance, exposure to upper management, obtaining challenging and visible assignments, and advocacy for promotion (Ibarra, 1993; Fombrun, 1982; Kanter, 1983; Pettigrew, 1973; Kram, 1988; Thomas, 1990). A relationship between two individuals is termed instrumental when it is made up of purely professional, functional, and necessary interactions. However, other kinds of relationships are also fostered in the workplace. *Expressive* ties involve the exchange of friendship and social support and usually involve higher levels of closeness and trust (Ibarra, 1993; Krackhardt & Porter, 1986). *Multiplex* ties involve the exchange of multiple resources and, for the purposes of this study, are specifically defined as the exchange of both instrumental and expressive resources.
Multiplexity from a personal network structure perspective is the literal overlap of instrumental and expressive networks.

Prior literature on multiplexity emphasizes how numerous connections between two people or two organizations may increase the strength and richness of a relationship and may also provide increased benefits to both parties compared to relationships with only one connection (Ibarra, 1992). Multiplex ties between individuals in the workplace are considered to be coveted relationships because of the increased types of network benefits potentially received which are usually greater than benefits from purely instrumental ties (Ibarra, 1993; Granovetter, 1973; Tichy, 1981). Besides Ibarra’s (1992) study which found that men’s networks have a higher degree of multiplexity than women’s networks, there is limited literature suggesting how and why men may prefer multiplex ties more than women or vice-versa.

It seems that the ideal relationship in an organizational setting for both men and women would be the multiplex relationship because it provides both instrumental and expressive resources which together may increase the overall strength of the relationship. It is widely known that accessing instrumental resources is critical in order to succeed in organizations. However, the ability to access expressive resources in addition to instrumental resources may be even more powerful because of the potentially stronger nature of the multiplex tie. In situations involving a career-related decision, an inherently instrumental scenario, but one which also requires the trust and communication necessary in an advice-seeking situation, I argue that both men and women, if given the opportunity, would prefer seeking advice from multiplex ties. One reason for this is that multiplex relationships may simply offer more resources than instrumental relationships.
In addition, advice-seekers may view the friendship component in multiplex relationships as a way to make advice-seeking less threatening because it is associated with greater trust. Therefore, I hypothesize:

**Hypothesis 2 (H2):** Men and women prefer seeking career-related advice from others with whom they have multiplex ties more than from others with whom they have only instrumental ties.

*The Interaction: Relationship Type and Gender-based Homophily*

The prior two hypotheses hone in on the effects of gender-based homophily and relationship type separately. Now, consider what might happen when these two variables, gender-based homophily and relationship type, interact with each other: do men’s and women’s preferences change, and if so, do they change in the same or in different ways? Prior literature has not systematically examined the interaction effects of relationship type and gender-based homophily on men’s and women’s network preferences. Building a logical conclusion from the prior hypotheses that both men and women prefer their own gender more than the opposite gender (H1), and that both men and women prefer multiplex ties more than instrumental ties (H2), I predict:

**Hypothesis 3 (H3):** Both men and women most prefer seeking career-related advice from same-sex others with whom they have multiplex ties.

However, when same-sex multiplex ties are not available, a valid concern in today’s workplace, what is the next most preferred combination of relationship-type and gender for men and for women? By focusing on “next preferences”, or advice-givers who are next most likely to be approached by men and women after same-sex multiplex ties, relationship type and gender-based homophily may be untangled from each other in a way that reveals gender differences in network preferences. Thus, I predict that men and women will have different next preferences.
In terms of women’s preferences, I posit that women will place more importance on the relationship with the advice-giver than on the gender of the advice-giver. Hence, women are more likely to seek advice from those with whom they share a multiplex relationship than from those with whom they only share their gender. Several reasons support this proposition. As stated in the gender stereotype literature, assuming women are more self-disclosing (Cozby, 1973) and amiable (Eagly & Mladinic, 1994; Eagly & Mladinic, 1989; Eagly, Mladinic, & Otto, 1994) than men, both of these qualities lead to building close relationships with others. Also, women may gravitate toward multiplex relationships more so than purely instrumental relationships because women place great value on the expressive component of multiplex relationships which provides emotional benefits. Indeed, expressiveness, or exchanging friendship and support resources, seems to be closely related to the communality trait prevalent in the gender stereotype literature where women are often described as more communal, that is outwardly-oriented in the way they demonstrate concern and understanding for others (Eagly & Mladinic, 1994; Eagly & Mladinic, 1989; Eagly, Mladinic, & Otto, 1994).

Women may be drawn to the expressive resources that are epitomized by multiplex ties, but they may also shy away from other women with whom they share only instrumental ties. In 2008, women still comprise a very small percentage of top management positions in the Fortune 500 (Catalyst) supporting the idea that senior-status positions in organizations are stereotypically male (Helfat, Harris, & Wolfson, 2006), and the characteristics required to succeed in such positions are often described as agentic, instrumental or masculine in nature (Martell et. al. 1998). Therefore, women who hold senior-status positions in the workplace may be considered to be those women who
succeed at male gender-typed tasks (Heilman et. al., 2004). Such women are said to violate gender-stereotype prescriptions, or expectations of how women are “supposed” to act (Heilman, 1995). Research has shown that this contradiction of role prescription versus role actualization may cause violators to be penalized, and one prevalent type of penalization is social rejection (Heilman et. al. 2004).

It would appear that junior women in the workplace interested in seeking career advice, assuming they themselves wish to ascend the corporate ladder, would not be among those who penalize other women for succeeding at male-typed tasks. However, research has found that “women sometimes react more negatively toward norm-deviant women than men,” (Parks-Stamm, Heilman, & Hearns, 2008, p. 238). Researchers who delved into this unexpected phenomenon found that successful women threaten the self-image of other women who are not as successful and often junior. In order to mitigate this negative effect and restore self-image, threatened women discard successful women from their comparison group and justify their rejection with the reasoning that successful women have violated gender norms (Parks-Stamm, Heilman, & Hearns, 2008).

In line with the previous gender norms argument, when individuals violate expected stereotypes it may cause unexpected emotions in others (Fiske, Cuddy, Glick, & Xu, 2002). Fiske et. al. (2002) proposed a two-by-two “stereotype content model” where one axis is competence (high vs. low) and the other axis is warmth (high vs. low) (see Figure 3.1). Each quadrant is associated with the predicted primary emotions an individual who is placed in this quadrant is likely to invoke in others. I posit that instrumental ties with women would be placed in the high competence/low warmth quadrant, which evokes the primary emotion of envy in others. If junior women
experience envy, they may be more likely to discriminate against the envied person by way of social rejection and, therefore, be less likely to seek advice from women with whom they have only an instrumental relationship.

In addition, I posit that men will place more importance on seeking advice from others of the same gender than from others with whom they share a multiplex relationship. Assumptions about women and their abilities seem to be the primary driver causing men to want to seek advice from other men. A common stereotype exists that men are higher status than women, and therefore, more powerful than women (Bordieu, 1985). If men believe this to be true, then seeking advice from a woman no matter what type of relationship is shared (i.e. multiplex) is much less preferred than seeking advice from another man. Along the same lines, men perceive other men to be more influential than their female counterparts. In a study by Heilman and Haynes (2005), researchers examined the attributional rationalization of women’s success in mixed sex dyads to test their main hypothesis that women categorically receive less credit than men when team success is ambiguous. It was supported that “women were viewed as significantly less influential than men” when only information about the team was provided, whereas there was no significant difference in perceived influence when information about each individual was explicitly given (Heilman & Haynes, 2005). This finding supports the idea that men may generally view women, no matter what type of relationship they share, as less influential than men, unless they have specific evidence that disproves this assumption.
As discussed above, Fiske, Cuddy, & Glick (2006) (see Figure 1) argue that people assess others along two core dimension: competency and warmth. And, men are typically placed higher than women on the universal competency dimension. If men see other men as universally more competent than women, a fundamental characteristic required for success in the workplace, then men will be more likely to seek advice from other men than other women, no matter the relationship type. Applying Fiske et. al.’s (2002) warmth-competency model (see Figure 1), multiplex ties with women, who are high status but also relatively friendly, would most likely be placed in the high competency/high warmth box invoking feelings of admiration in others. Therefore, it could be argued that junior-level men may view senior-status women with whom they share multiplex ties with admiration causing them to approach multiplex ties with women for advice. However, the assumption about competence associated with being male is so strong that relationship type may even become inconsequential for men when considering whom to approach for advice because the expressive component of the multiplex relationship as stated above may be far less important to men. Overall, I argue that men’s negative assumptions about women and their competence greatly hinder this likelihood.

An additional explanation for why homophily may be the more dominant predictor of men’s advice-seeking behavior than relationship type is that the expressive component of the multiplex relationship may matter less to men because it is not the only means by which they can build trust and comfort in a relationship. Specifically research has shown that men may value “closeness in the doing” (Wood & Inman, 1993; Swain, 1989). For men, the act of doing things together, like working on the same assignment or
building a financial model with co-workers, is a means of relationship-building, like increasing trust and comfort. While these actions may seem purely instrumental in nature, men may also receive emotional benefits from the comradery they experience when accomplishing purely work-related tasks. Therefore, men may receive almost or as much emotional benefit from an instrumental relationship as from a multiplex relationship, making the emotional and social dimension less important for them.

As previously stated, Hypothesis 3 suggests that both men and women most likely prefer seeking advice from same-sex multiplex ties. Using the same logic, the least likely preference for both men and women would be an instrumental tie with the opposite sex. Not as straightforward is the prediction of the second choice, or “next” preference, when men and women subconsciously decide what is more valuable to them—relationship type or gender-based homophily. Based on the reasoning above, I predict that men will value gender-based homophily more than relationship type, and women will value relationship type more than gender-based homophily. Therefore, I hypothesize:

**Hypothesis 4 (H4):** When same-sex multiplex ties are not available, the gender of advice-seeker moderates the interaction between gender-based homophily and relationship type in predicting likelihood of career-related advice-seeking such that:

**Hypothesis 4a (H4a):** Men are more likely to seek advice from a same-sex instrumental tie than an opposite-sex multiplex tie.

**Hypothesis 4b (H4b):** Women are more likely to seek advice from an opposite-sex multiplex tie than a same-sex instrumental tie.

**METHOD**

**Subjects and Design**
Subjects were 138 people affiliated with a large northeastern university (62 men and 76 women), who were recruited by the university’s behavioral laboratory. The sample was made up of 79% students, of which 8% were MBA students and 92% were undergraduate students. The remaining 21% of the sample was composed of university employees distributed across the following categories: professional/managerial (9.5%); clerical/secretarial (5.8%); sales/retail (1.5%); services/labor (0.7%); and other (3.6%). Participants ranged from 18 to 61 years of age with a Mean age of 22.5 years.

To test the homophily and relationship type hypotheses, I used a 2x2x2 between-subjects factorial design involving three independent variables: sex of the subject, i.e., the advice-seeker, (male or female); sex of the advice-giver (male or female); and relationship type between the advice-seeker and the advice-giver (instrumental or multiplex). 62 males and 76 females (the advice-seekers) were randomly assigned to one of four experimentally manipulated conditions: sex of the advice-giver (male or female); and relationship type (instrumental or multiplex). I used a vignette study design to experimentally manipulate the sex of the advice-giver and the relationship type between the advice-seeker and advice-giver.

Procedure

In this laboratory study, all subjects were given the same vignette to read (see Appendix 1). Directions explicitly stated that each subject should imagine himself/herself as the person described in the scenario. The vignette describes a person who has been a solid performer in his/her role as an Analyst in the Mergers & Acquisitions division of a Wall Street investment bank. A professional quandary arises

---

2 Subjects came to the behavioral laboratory to participate in one hour’s worth of experiments of which this study was one, and in return each subject received $10.
because this person applied to business school and was admitted to two of the nation’s
top 15 MBA programs, but neither school is in the top 5. The person is perplexed about
his/her next career move as he/she weighs the following options: 1) forego business
school and continue to rise at the firm, 2) go to one of the business schools that offered
him/her an acceptance, or 3) reapply to business school next year in hopes of getting into
a top 5 program.

In order to better navigate this decision process, the person considers approaching
a Principal in the Mergers & Acquisitions group for advice. Principals are three levels
above Analysts in the organizational hierarchy. Additionally, Principals in the group are
described as being equally male and female, particularly well-regarded, having
substantial firm tenure, and having exceptional work experience. However, the effort
required to approach any one of these Principals is significant due to their senior status
and busy schedules. Then, a brief characterization of the person’s relationship, either
instrumental or multiplex, with only one of these Principals is given, and the Principal’s
gender is manipulated by either the name Jennifer or Steve. Based on this brief
description, participants were asked a host of questions including how likely they were to
approach the given Principal for career advice.

Experimental manipulations

Sex of advice-giver. Information about sex of the advice-giver was manipulated by the
name in the brief description of the Principal, or advice-giver, given in each condition
(i.e., Jennifer or Steve). This manipulation is consistent with several studies done by
Heilman and colleagues (e.g. Heilman, et. al., 2004; Heilman & Welle, 2006; Heilman &
Okimoto, 2007; etc.) to control sex of a target in studies of gender differences and career outcomes.

**Relationship type shared with advice-giver.** Information about relationship type shared with the advice-giver was manipulated in the brief description of the Principal, which either specified a purely professional relationship (instrumental), or a professional relationship combined with a friendship element (multiplex). The instrumental relationship type was operationalized by the information that conversations take place on a professional level regarding mostly work-related issues; whereas the expressive component of the multiplex relationship type was operationalized by the act of occasionally jogging together. The text of the relationship type manipulation is below (see Appendix 3):

**Instrumental.** Jennifer (Steve) is known as a star at the firm. You know Jennifer (Steve) because you were a member of one of Jennifer’s (Steve’s) deal teams. Your conversations take place on a professional level regarding mostly work-related issues. You consider Jennifer (Steve) to be a colleague rather than a friend. Your relationship is based only on professional interactions since you have never interacted with Jennifer (Steve) on a personal level.

or

**Multiplex.** Jennifer (Steve) is known as a star at the firm. You know Jennifer (Steve) because you were a member of one of Jennifer’s (Steve’s) deal teams. You also know Jennifer (Steve) because you both trained for the NYC marathon and you occasionally ran together. Your conversations take place on both a professional level (where strictly work-related issues are discussed) and a personal level (where mostly non-work related issues are discussed). You consider Jennifer (Steve) to be a colleague and a friend. Your relationship is based on both professional interactions and personal interactions.

**Dependent Measures**

**Likelihood of Career-related Advice-seeking.** The dependent variable, called likelihood of career-related advice-seeking, is a composite measure of the advice-seeker’s likelihood
to seek career-related advice from the potential advice-giver. Likelihood of career-related advice-seeking was derived from the average score, each measured on a Likert Scale of 1 to 7, of three items which were asked after the participant read the vignette and description of Jennifer or Steve. The items were: (a) How likely are you to approach Jennifer (Steve) for advice in your current situation? (b) How much do you want Jennifer’s (Steve’s) advice about your current situation?, and (c) How difficult would it be for you to approach Jennifer (Steve) for advice in your current situation? (Reverse scored). A principal component analysis was performed which determined that all three items comprising the dependent variable, likelihood of career-related advice-seeking, loaded on one factor, each above the 0.70 level. The reliability of the scale (Cronbach’s Alpha) is 0.72.

Results

Manipulation checks

In order to determine if and how participants gender-stereotyped the four potential types of advice-givers (men with instrumental ties; men with multiplex ties; women with instrumental ties; and women with multiplex ties), a short version of the Bem Sex Role Inventory (BSRI) consisting of 14 items measuring perceived masculinity and femininity of the advice-givers was collected using a Likert Scale of 1 to 7. Sample items for femininity included “warm” and “understanding,” whereas sample items for masculinity included “dominant” and “aggressive.” To determine if the manipulation of sex of the advice-giver was perceived appropriately by the participants, I examined the perceived masculinity-femininity scores of the advice-givers (see Table 3.1). Female advice-givers, as expected, scored significantly higher on the BSRI for perceived femininity (women

**INSERT TABLE 3.1 HERE**

To determine if participants viewed the instrumental and multiplex relationship conditions differently, and based on the reasoning in the theory section about the expressive component of multiplex relationships being compatible with female gender stereotypes and instrumental relationships, I examined the differences in the masculinity-femininity scores (Bem Sex Role Inventory Scale [BSRI]) by relationship type (see Table 3.2). As expected, multiplex relationships scored significantly higher than instrumental relationships on BSRI for femininity (mult. fem. $M = 4.25$ vs. instr. fem. $M = 3.49$, $F(1, 136) = 47.08$, $p < .001$) and lower on masculinity, though not significantly so (mult. masc. $M = 5.64$ vs. instr. masc. $M = 5.74$, $F(1, 137) = 0.799$, $p < .373$). Results of the manipulation checks support the idea that participants perceived potential advice-givers appropriately in different conditions.

**INSERT TABLE 3.2 HERE**

**Data Analysis**

Several models using analysis of variance (ANOVA) were examined, modeling main effects and all two-way and three-way interactions. The means and standard deviations of the dependent variable, likelihood of career-related advice-seeking, by each condition are shown in Table 3.3. In addition, in order to understand the underlying mechanisms driving the two-way and three-way interaction effects, I conducted several
intercell contrasts in line with my hypotheses using the Fisher’s least significant difference test (significance level set at $p < .05$) (Heilman & Haynes, 2005).

**Gender-based homophily.** I hypothesized (H1) that both men and women will prefer seeking advice from same-sex others rather than from opposite-sex others. In order to test this hypothesis, the two-way interaction between the gender of the advice-giver and the gender of the advice-seeker was analyzed (See Table 3.4 for Means). There is a significant interaction effect of the combination of the gender of advice-giver and the gender of the advice-seeker on the advice-giver’s likelihood of advice-seeking, $F(1, 138) = 6.55, p = .012$ (See Table 3.7). Interpretation of this result is that gender-homophily seems to be an important factor, but it needs to be teased apart in order to understand how exactly it affects likelihood of advice-seeking.

Upon further analysis of the two-way interaction between gender of advice-giver and gender of advice-seeker concerning the gender-based homophily hypothesis (H1), I find that men do not significantly prefer same-sex advice-givers ($M = 5.04$) more than opposite-sex advice-givers ($M = 4.56$) (Table 5, Contrast 1, $p = .155$), while women prefer seeking advice from same-sex advice-givers ($M = 5.38$), although the finding is marginally significant, more than opposite-sex advice-givers ($M = 4.95$) (Table 3.5, Contrast 2, $p = .083$). It is unclear whether the main effect of gender is driven by women or whether something else is going on because of restricted sample size.
**Relationship type.** I hypothesized (H2) that both men and women will prefer seeking advice from others with whom they share multiplex ties ($M = 5.58$) more than from others with whom they share instrumental ties ($M = 4.41$). This hypothesis was supported by the significant main effect of relationship type on likelihood of advice-seeking, $F(1, 138) = 43.44, p < .001$ (see Table 3.6 for Means and Figure 3.3), indicating that both men and women are significantly more likely to seek advice from individuals with whom they share multiplex ties than from individuals with whom they share instrumental ties ($t = 6.27, p < .001, \eta^2_{[between-group]} = .014$).

**Same-sex multiplex ties.** I hypothesized (H3) that both men ($M = 5.88$) and women ($M = 6.04$) will prefer seeking advice from same-sex multiplex ties more than any other type of tie. This hypothesis was partially supported indicating that men are most likely to seek advice from same-sex multiplex ties and women are just likely to seek advice from same-sex multiplex ties ($M = 6.04$) as from opposite-sex multiplex ties ($M = 5.46$). Even though the means were in the expected direction, there was no significant difference between women’s first and next preferences. It is clear, however, that women most prefer multiplex ties, no matter the gender.

**“Next” preferences.** I hypothesized (H4) that the gender of advice-seeker moderates the interaction of gender-based homophily and relationship type in predicting the likelihood of career-related advice-seeking. In order to test this hypothesis, the three-way interaction between gender of advice-seeker, gender of advice-giver, and relationship type was analyzed (see Table 3.7 for Means). There is a marginally significant 3-way interaction (Relationship type * Gender of advice-giver * Gender of advice-seeker) on the
advice-giver’s likelihood of advice-seeking, $F(1, 138) = 2.93, p = .089$ (see Table 3.8). The 3-way interaction (relationship type * gender of advice-giver * gender of advice-seeker) is plotted (see Figures 3.4 & 3.5) in two separate graphs, one for male advice-seekers only, and the other for female advice-seekers only. This result signals that there may be underlying gender differences driving this three-way interaction worth further exploring. In order to detect differences and nuances, it is necessary to perform more specific contrasts tests by gender in order to better understand “next” preferences.

INSERT TABLES 3.7 AND 3.8 HERE

“Next” preference for men. The hypothesis (H4a) stating that men are more likely to seek advice from a same-sex instrumental tie than an opposite-sex multiplex tie was tested by performing a contrast (see Table 3.9; Contrast 4) which was not significant, $t(265) = 1.73, p < .10$, indicating that men are just as likely to seek advice from same-sex instrumental ties as they are from opposite-sex multiplex ties. However, upon examining another relevant contrast, (see Table 3.9: Contrast 3 and Figure 3.4), it was found that men significantly prefer male multiplex advice-givers ($M = 5.88$) over female multiplex advice-givers ($M = 4.93$, $t(130) = 2.53, p < .05$). From this finding, it may be inferred that men indeed value same-sex ties and that relationship type is not as important.

INSERT TABLE 3.9 AND FIGURE 3.4

“Next” preference for women. The hypothesis (H4b) stating that women are more likely to seek advice from an opposite-sex multiplex tie than a same-sex instrumental tie was tested by performing a contrast (see Table 3.9; Contrast 2) which was significant ($p = .026$), lending support for this hypothesis indicating that women prefer multiplexity over gender-based homophily. And, after examining another relevant contrast (see Table 3.9:
Contrast 4 and Figure 3.5), it was found that female advice-seeker do not significantly prefer, \( t (130) = 1.66, p < .10 \), female multiplex advice-givers \( (M = 6.04) \) more than male multiplex advice-givers \( (M = 5.46) \) further supporting the hypothesis (H4b) that women value multiplex ties and gender is not as important.

INSERT TABLE 3.9 AND FIGURE 3.5 HERE

Upon examining the interaction of relationship type and gender-based homophily for men, results indicated that there is no significant difference in next preferences between same-sex instrumental ties and opposite-sex multiplex ties. I had hypothesized that men would value gender over relationship type, but this was only marginally supported.

Additional findings

Gender of advice-seeker. Although I did not hypothesize about the effects of gender of the advice-seeker on likelihood of advice-seeking, I found a significant main effect of gender of advice-seeker on likelihood of advice-seeking, \( F(1, 138) = 5.04, p = .026 \) (see Table 3.10), indicating that women (advice-seekers) reported a significantly greater likelihood of seeking advice \( (M = 5.19) \) than men (advice-seekers) \( (M = 4.79) \) (see Table 3.10 and Figure 3.6). This result may imply that either women (advice-seekers) were more liberal in using the Likert scale than men; women were more likely to approach others for career-related advice than men; or a combination of the two.

INSERT TABLE 3.10 AND FIGURE 3.6 HERE

Gender of advice-giver. Although I did not hypothesize about the gender of the advice-giver, to rule out the notion that people are more likely to approach men for advice given higher status and competency assumptions, I examined the main effect of gender of
advice-giver. There was no main effect of gender of advice-giver on likelihood of advice-seeking, $F(1, 138) = .003, p = .957$ (see Table 3.8), suggesting that people are equally likely to seek advice from men as from women under the right circumstances.

“No Relationship” type. In order to test the meaning of the instrumental and multiplex relationship conditions examined here, I also collected data on advice-seeking given a “No relationship” condition, defined as no prior relationship between the advice-seeker and advice-giver except that they both worked at the same firm. I examined this condition to determine if advice-seekers significantly prefer seeking advice from advice-givers with whom they share some kind of relationship (either instrumental or multiplex), rather than from advice-givers with whom they have no relationship. Indeed, advice-seekers are more likely to seek advice from individuals with whom they share a multiplex relationship ($M = 5.58$) than from those with whom they have “no relationship” ($M = 3.53$), $t (130) = 10.94, p < .001$. Also, advice-seekers are more likely to seek advice from individuals with whom they share an instrumental relationship ($M = 4.44$) than from those with whom they have “no relationship” ($M = 3.53$), $t (133) = 5.23, p < .001$ (see Figure 3.7).

In summary, results of this study provide support for many of the hypotheses that were tested. Hypothesis 1 regarding gender-based homophily was marginally supported for women preferring to seek advice from other women over men, but results did not support men preferring to seek advice from other men over women. Hypothesis 2 regarding relationship type was supported: both men and women prefer the multiplex relationship over the instrumental relationship. Results for Hypotheses 3 and 4, regarding
relationship type and gender-based homophily, indicate that gender of the advice-seeker matters when considering both relationship type and gender of the advice-giver. Hypothesis 3 was partially supported indicating that men and women prefer same-sex multiplex ties more than any other type of tie. Hypothesis 4 was partially supported such that there was no support for H4a regarding men’s next preferences, but there was support for H4b regarding women’s next preferences. Specifically, men did not exhibit a clear next preference for same-sex versus multiplex ties, while women did exhibit a clear next preference for multiplex versus same-sex ties.

Discussion

Results of this study suggest that men and women prefer seeking career-related advice from same-sex multiplex ties more than any other type of tie, and gender of the advice-giver does not seem to matter. The finding for men supports prior field research on gender differences in networks which found that men’s networks have a high degree of multiplex ties. However, the finding for women contradicts prior field research which found that women’s networks do not have the same high numbers of multiplex ties as men’s networks (Ibarra, 1992). Ibarra (1992) explained this finding by suggesting that women tend to connect with men for instrumental resources and with women for expressive resources, but it remained unclear whether this phenomenon was due to women’s preference or the organizational gender composition (Ibarra, 1992). The current study provides evidence that if given the opportunity women would most likely seek career-related advice from multiplex ties. Findings from this study also have implications for the organizational gender composition explanation. Moreover, it may be inferred that prior gender and network research seems to have entangled preference with
organizational composition constraints, and the scarcity of multiplex ties in women’s workplace networks relative to men’s networks most likely does not reflect preference, but rather the availability of senior women to provide instrumental resources along with social and emotional support. Therefore, the findings here suggest that if women had the opportunity to approach same-sex others with whom they shared multiplex ties for career advice, they would seize it.

Findings from this study may seem counter to prior research which has shown that women, even if they are often considered to be part of the low-status group, have strong identification with their in-group (Rudman & Goodwin, 2004). In a series of experiments by Rudman & Goodwin (2004), it was found that women, significantly more so than men, showed a stronger sense of “cognitive balance” in the domain of in-group bias demonstrating that women may have a special mechanism that strengthens the automatic response to favor their own group (p. 494). This mechanism, bolstering automatic in-group bias, may be exercised in the workplace as women’s need to “stick together” for support and synergistic strength is often even more important inside rather than outside of the workplace (Kanter, 1977). However, for women the story is more complex because on one hand there is a driver to identify with one’ gender in-group (women), but on the other hand some research has found that individuals may choose not to identify with a low status in-group, and instead identify with a higher status group. Thus while there is an argument for homophily for women, competing demands may explain a key finding in this study which supports multiplexity for women, no matter the gender.
In many organizations, due to the lack of women in senior-level positions, it is difficult for junior women to form multiplex ties with very senior-status women making today’s workplace often simply unable to accommodate women’s likely network preferences. For this reason, it is necessary to understand if and how men’s and women’s preference hierarchies differ when seeking career-related advice. Whom do men and women prefer approaching for advice next?

For women, the interaction of relationship type and gender-based homophily indicated, in support of the hypothesis (H4b), that women next prefer seeking advice from opposite-sex multiplex ties more than same-sex instrumental ties. Here, again, we see that women are in search of multiplex ties no matter the gender because the expressive component of the relationship is perceived by women to be much more desirable and beneficial than a purely instrumental tie. In line with this finding, Burt (1998) found a strong correlation between women who were connected to male senior-status others outside their work group and their career success measured by time of promotion. The explanation behind this correlation effect was that certain senior-status males would voluntarily act as sponsors for junior women to help promote career success. In essence, women who would borrow social capital via a senior status male sponsor, a relationship that I would categorize as multiplex, experienced more career success than women who did not have a sponsor. This supports the finding that women do not necessarily prefer women when multiplexity is available. As long as these sponsors offered multiplex resources, it did not matter that they were predominantly men in contrast to the supporters of a homophily argument who would be puzzled by Burt’s (1998) findings that junior women have multiplex ties with men in their networks.
Another interesting finding of this study is that both men and women placed instrumental ties with women low on their preference hierarchies. This finding is consistent with the idea that instrumental ties with women are perceived as more agentic in nature than multiplex ties with women, and as a result these women are penalized in the form of social rejection (Heilman & Okimoto, 2006). Furthermore, Berdahl (2007) defines a group of very successful women in the workplace as “uppity,” or those “women who step out of place by assuming characteristics considered more desirable for men” (Berdahl, 2007, p. 425), and “uppity” women are more likely to be discriminated against than women who exhibit feminine characteristics. Based on Berdahl’s (2007) definition of these women as competitive and aggressive, I would argue that an instrumental tie with a female advice-giver could be categorized as an “uppity” woman. Moreover, the Bem Sex Role Inventory data from the current study supports this argument as instrumental ties with women were viewed as more competitive and aggressive than multiplex ties with women.

The current study has a number of potential limitations. First, subjects were primarily undergraduate students with limited work experience, which may have caused potential difficulty in identifying with the vignette and which may limit the generalizability of these findings. However, when participants were asked about the scenario, the group reported, on a Likert scale from 1 to 7, that they agreed the situation was realistic ($M = 5.26$). Furthermore, the descriptions of the relationship with the advice-giver were intentionally simple and brief in order to clearly and accurately manipulate the independent variables of interest. Brevity and the lack of individual information in the descriptions may also have purposely enabled subjects to employ their
own stereotypes. However, oversimplified descriptions of advice-givers may have made it difficult for subjects to imagine whom they would approach for advice. The organizational context of the vignette was a Wall Street investment bank, widely known to be male-dominated, which may have skewed gender preferences. However, this context is consistent with many organizational settings that are dominated by men in leadership positions (Roth, 2004). Future research is needed to identify whether there are conditions under which gender network preferences change, for example, in a more gender-neutral or female-dominated organizational environment. Another limitation is that the expressive component of the multiplex relationship was operationalized by a sport (running together), which may have biased men in their next preference (H4a) toward multiplex ties with women. If the expressive component of the multiplex relationship was activated by a more emotional activity like disclosing something intimate or bonding over some kind of emotional event, the likelihood of males approaching an opposite-sex multiplex tie versus a same-sex instrumental tie as their next preference may have been less.

Despite the above limitations, this study has both theoretical and methodological contributions in the way it systematically examined the interaction effects of relationship type and gender-based homophily on men’s and women’s network preferences. This study adds to the existing literature on gender differences in personal networks by examining men’s and women’s preferences as opposed to their perceived network composition. From a theoretical perspective, this is important as it allows us to disentangle the differential constraints placed on men and women by workplace composition from their potential behavior if senior positions in organizations were more
equally distributed across gender. Methodologically, all the studies in this dissertation utilized an experimental design where organizational composition constraints were eliminated and variables of interest were manipulated to establish causality. Furthermore, employing the vignette technique allowed the incorporation of a realistic work situation and provided the exact same work situation to both men and women across all the studies which helped to distinguish between personal preference and availability more clearly.

Finally, this study takes into account the real limitations placed on men and women due to organizational constraints by examining their next preference. By analyzing men’s and women’s network preference hierarchies, gender differences become more discernable particularly in regard to the tradeoffs that are sometimes made when choosing between gender-homophily and relationship type. Evidence from this study notably demonstrates that both men and women desire multiplex ties in the workplace.

For more than a decade in network research, organizational composition and personal preference have confounded the effects of relationship type and gender when it comes to understanding whom men and women connect with in the workplace. This study not only untangled these key choice variables, but it also succeeded in more fully understanding the interaction effect between relationship type and gender. However, further investigation is necessary in order to better understand gender and networks, and in particular, how men and women may benefit professionally from valuable personal network resources in the workplace.
Chapter Four: Conclusion

The purpose of this dissertation was to identify men’s and women’s network preferences, without the limitation of organizational composition constraints, when seeking career-related advice regarding three choice variables: gender, status, and relationship type.

In the first study (Chapter Two: Study 1), both status and gender were operationalized in a vignette that placed participants in a professional quandary where they were given the opportunity to seek career-related advice from either a higher-status man or woman (Condition 1) or an equal-status man or woman (Condition 2). Findings suggest that both men and women were more likely to seek advice from higher-status others than equal-status others. Women display a strong preference for seeking advice from other women, or gender-based homophily, in both the high-status and equal-status conditions. Men, on the other hand, do not seem to have a strong preference for men or women in the higher-status condition suggesting that men are primarily concerned about seeking advice from higher-status others no matter the gender. In the equal-status condition, however, men show a clear preference for gender-based homophily suggesting that when status striving is not an option, men prefer seeking advice from other men about their careers.

In the second study (Chapter Two: Study 2), which was a replication of the first study except the sample was made up of working lawyers (n = 50) instead of undergraduate students (n = 167), findings suggest that both men and women are more likely to seek advice from higher-status others than equal-status others as in the first study. Again, women display a strong preference for seeking advice from other women,
or gender-based homophily, in both the high-status and equal-status conditions. However, unlike the first study, findings suggest that men also prefer gender-based homophily in both the higher-status and equal-status conditions. One explanation for this conflicting result compared to Study 1 is that experienced male working lawyers may be more accustomed to approaching men for advice than women in their respective organizations, and they transferred this behavior to the vignette. In this way, the role of organization composition constraints, where there is not equal representation or availability of both sexes particularly at the higher levels of organizations, may have played an unintended role in the subconscious of male participant lawyers. Another explanation is that the sample size in this condition was very small (n = 15) which may have limited the reliability of the results. For the future, it would be beneficial to increase the sample size of this study with another working population.

In the third study (Chapter Three), all the potential advice-givers were higher status given convincing findings in both Studies 1 and 2 where both men and women were more likely to seek advice from higher-status others than equal-status others. Relationship type (instrumental and multiplex) and gender were operationalized in a similar vignette as the prior two studies placing participants in a professional quandary where they were given the opportunity to seek career-related advice, except in this study, participants were from only one potential advice-giver (multiplex male; multiplex female; instrumental male; instrumental female). Whereas Studies 1 and 2 were a mixed model design of both between- and within-subjects, this study was a pure between-subjects design.
Findings from the third study (Chapter Three) suggest that both men and women are more likely to seek advice from those with whom they have multiplex ties rather than those with whom they have instrumental ties. After layering gender into the equation, both men and women most prefer seeking advice from same-sex multiplex ties. And, when same-sex ties are not available, which is often the reality in many organizations, the “next” preference for women is to seek advice from a male with a multiplex tie, whereas the “next” preference for men is either to seek advice from a male with an instrumental tie or a female with a multiplex tie. It is interesting that, after more specifically explaining the relationship between the advice-seeker and the advice-giver, women in the “next” preference are willing to trade-off their strong penchant for gender-based homophily (as found in Study 1 and Study 2) for a male with a multiplex tie. One implication of this finding is that women seem to place a higher value on the friendship component of a multiplex relationship than on gender-based homophily. For men, the fact that they do not show a preference for gender-based homophily in the “next” preference echoes the finding in Study 1 where men did not show a preference for men or women in the higher-status condition. One practical implication of these similar findings, where men do not have a strong preference for gender-based homophily, is the encouragement it gives to higher status women in organizations, who often struggle to prove their competence to men even after they have reached upper-level management, that men may be willing to seek after them for career-related advice. A summary of the results across the studies is presented in Table 18.

INSERT TABLE 18 HERE

Contributions
This dissertation has both theoretical and methodological contributions in the way it systematically examined the effect of status, relationship type and the interaction effects of status and gender, and relationship type and gender on men’s and women’s network preferences when seeking career-related advice. Theoretically, this dissertation adds to the existing literature on gender differences in personal networks by identifying men’s and women’s network preferences, without any organizational composition constraints, as opposed to their structural network composition. Methodologically, not only were the studies in this dissertation performed in the lab where organizational composition constraints were eliminated and variables of interest were manipulated. Furthermore, employing the vignette technique allowed the incorporation of a realistic work situation and provided the exact same work situation to both men and women across all the studies which helped to distinguish between personal preference and availability more clearly.

For more than a decade in network research, organizational composition and personal preference have confounded the effects of relationship type and gender when it comes to understanding whom men and women connect with in the workplace. This dissertation not only has untangled key variables, but it also contributes to the existing literature by more fully articulating men’s and women network preferences with regard to gender, status and relationship type.
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Appendix 1.

Vignette story used in Chapter Two (Study 1 and Study 2) and Chapter Three (Study 3)

Please read the following description and try hard to imagine that you are actually in the situation. Close your eyes and think about how you would think and feel. Please take this seriously then respond to the questions that follow.

After college graduation, you accepted a position as an Analyst in the Mergers & Acquisitions (M&A) group of Hammersmith, a Wall Street investment bank. Judging from your formal reviews and compensation, you are a consistent and solid performer at Hammersmith. During your third year at Hammersmith, you decide to apply to business school. You receive news that you have been admitted to two of the top 15 MBA programs, but neither school is in the top 5. You are not sure of your next career move. You are struggling with several questions, like: Should I forego the MBA and continue to rise in the ranks at Hammersmith? Should I go back to business school? If I go back to school, should I accept one of these offers or reapply next year with the hopes of getting into a top 5 program?

You are considering approaching someone in the M&A group for advice. There is transparency that you have applied to business school, so approaching someone in your group for advice will pose no threat to your reputation, firm standing, or potential promotion. There are a handful of people at various levels, both male and female, in the M&A group that you are considering approaching.
Appendix 2.

Status of Advice-giver and Gender of Advice-giver Manipulations (Study 1 and Study 2)

Higher-status. Jennifer (Steve) is at a higher level than you in the firm. Jennifer (Steve) is performing well. You have had some professional and social interaction with Jennifer (Steve).

or

Equal-status. Jennifer (Steve) is at the same level as you in the firm. Jennifer (Steve) is performing well. You have had some professional and social interaction with Jennifer (Steve).
Appendix 3.

Relationship Type with Advice-giver and Gender of Advice-giver Manipulations (Study 3)

*Instrumental.* Jennifer (Steve) is known as a star at the firm. You know Jennifer (Steve) because you were a member of one of Jennifer’s (Steve’s) deal teams. Your conversations take place on a professional level regarding mostly work-related issues. You consider Jennifer (Steve) to be a colleague rather than a friend. Your relationship is based only on professional interactions since you have never interacted with Jennifer (Steve) on a personal level.

*or*

*Multiplex.* Jennifer (Steve) is known as a star at the firm. You know Jennifer (Steve) because you were a member of one of Jennifer’s (Steve’s) deal teams. You also know Jennifer (Steve) because you both trained for the NYC marathon and you occasionally ran together. Your conversations take place on both a professional level (where strictly work-related issues are discussed) and a personal level (where mostly non-work related issues are discussed). You consider Jennifer (Steve) to be a colleague and a friend. Your relationship is based on both professional interactions and personal interactions.
TABLES

Chapter Two: Study 1

Table 2.1. Likelihood of Advice-seeking on Status of Advice-giver (Main Effect)

Means and Standard Deviations of Likelihood in Advice-seeking for Status of Advice-giver

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status of Advice-giver</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Likelihood in advice-seeking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Higher-level advice-givers</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>5.56 (0.78)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal-level advice-givers</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>4.32 (1.30)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Standard deviations appear in parentheses. All ratings were done on 7-point scales, and the higher the number, the more favorable the rating.
Table 2.2. Likelihood of Gender-based Homophily when Advice-seeking

*Means and Standard Deviations of Advice of a Male Advice Giver (M=1) vs. a Female Advice-Giver (M=2).*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender of Participant</th>
<th>Higher-level Male Advice-Giver vs. Higher Level Female Advice-giver</th>
<th>Equal-level Male Advice-Giver vs. Equal-Level Female Advice-giver</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male advice-seeker</td>
<td>1.53 (0.51)</td>
<td>1.32 (0.47)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$n = 38$</td>
<td>$n = 38$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female advice-seeker</td>
<td>1.75 (0.44)</td>
<td>1.80 (0.40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$n = 44$</td>
<td>$n = 46$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* Standard deviations appear in parentheses. Male Advice Giver = 1 and Female Advice Giver = 2.
Table 2.3. Test of Between Subject Effects for Status of Advice-giver * Gender of Participant

*Test of Between Subject Effects for a Two-Factorial (2 x 2) Design*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>7.583</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.264</td>
<td>6.331</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>10.718</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.718</td>
<td>53.689</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social desirability</td>
<td>0.624</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.624</td>
<td>3.124</td>
<td>0.079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age of participant</td>
<td>0.547</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.547</td>
<td>2.742</td>
<td>0.100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female advice-giver first</td>
<td>0.390</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.390</td>
<td>1.954</td>
<td>0.164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status of advice-giver</td>
<td>0.212</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.212</td>
<td>1.063</td>
<td>0.304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender of participant</td>
<td>5.626</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.626</td>
<td>28.180</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status of advice-giver* Gender of participant</td>
<td>0.959</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.959</td>
<td>4.802</td>
<td>0.030*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>31.742</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>0.200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>472.000</td>
<td>166</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>39.325</td>
<td>165</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05; \( R^2 = .193\) (Adjusted \( R^2 = .162\))
Chapter Two: Study 2

Table 2.4. Likelihood of Advice-seeking on Status of Advice-giver (Main Effect)

Means and Standard Deviations of Likelihood in Advice-seeking for Status of Advice-giver

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status of Advice-giver</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Likelihood in advice-seeking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Higher-level advice-givers</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5.28 (1.24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal-level advice-givers</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4.18 (1.37)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Standard deviations appear in parentheses. All ratings were done on 7-point scales, and the higher the number, the more favorable the rating.
Table 2.5. Likelihood of Gender-based Homophily when Advice-seeking

*Means and Standard Deviations of Likelihood of Seeking Advice from a Male Advice Giver (M=1) vs. Female Advice-Giver (M=2).*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender of Participant</th>
<th>Higher-level Male Advice-Giver vs. Higher Level Female Advice-giver</th>
<th>Equal-level Male Advice-Giver vs. Equal-Level Female Advice-giver</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Male advice-seeker    | 1.27 (0.42)  
\(n = 15\) | 1.31 (0.46)  
\(n = 18\) |
| Female advice-seeker  | 1.88 (0.35)  
\(n = 8\) | 1.71 (0.45)  
\(n = 12\) |

*Note:* Standard deviations appear in parentheses. Ratings were done on 2-point scale where Male Advice Giver = 1 and Female Advice Giver = 2.
Table 2.6. Likelihood of Advice-seeking: Test of Between Subject Effects for Status of Advice-giver * Gender of Participant

*Test of Between Subject Effects for a Two-Factorial (2 x 2) Design*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>3.930</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.655</td>
<td>3.640</td>
<td>0.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>2.348</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.348</td>
<td>13.047</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social desirability</td>
<td>0.294</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.294</td>
<td>1.635</td>
<td>0.207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age of participant</td>
<td>0.636</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.636</td>
<td>3.534</td>
<td>0.066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female advice-giver first</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td>0.886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status of target</td>
<td>0.063</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.063</td>
<td>0.349</td>
<td>0.557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender of participant</td>
<td>2.073</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.073</td>
<td>11.521</td>
<td>0.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status of target * Gender of participant</td>
<td>0.081</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.081</td>
<td>0.452</td>
<td>0.505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>8.277</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>0.180</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>127.000</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>12.208</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R Squared = .322 (Adjusted R Squared = .234)

* p < .05
Table 2.7. Influence Perception of Advice-giver

*Means and Standard Deviations of Perceived Influence of a Male Advice-giver (M=1) vs. Female Advice-giver (M=2).*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender of Participant</th>
<th>Higher-level Male Advice-giver vs. Higher Level Female Advice-giver</th>
<th>Equal-level Male Advice-giver vs. Equal-Level Female Advice-giver</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male advice-seeker</td>
<td>1.50 (0.48)</td>
<td>1.54 (0.46)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(n = 12)</td>
<td>(n = 14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female advice-seeker</td>
<td>1.79 (0.39)</td>
<td>1.25 (0.38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(n = 7)</td>
<td>(n = 8)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* Standard deviations appear in parentheses. Ratings were done on 2-point scale where Male Advice Giver = 1 and Female Advice Giver = 2.
Table 2.8. Influence Perception of Advice-giver: Test of Between Subject Effects for Status of Advice-giver * Gender of Participant

*Test of Between Subject Effects for a Two-Factorial (2 x 2) Design*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>2.031</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.338</td>
<td>1.852</td>
<td>0.118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>4.247</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.247</td>
<td>23.243</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social desirability</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>0.062</td>
<td>0.805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age of participant</td>
<td>0.567</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.567</td>
<td>3.101</td>
<td>0.087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank of participant</td>
<td>0.119</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.119</td>
<td>0.652</td>
<td>0.425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status of advice-giver</td>
<td>0.728</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.728</td>
<td>3.982</td>
<td>0.054*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender of participant</td>
<td>0.053</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.053</td>
<td>0.289</td>
<td>0.594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status of advice-giver * Gender of participant</td>
<td>0.799</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.799</td>
<td>4.374</td>
<td>0.044*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>6.213</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0.183</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>102.000</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>8.244</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R Squared = .246 (Adjusted R Squared = .113)

* p < .05
Chapter Three: Study 3

Table 3.1. Gender Manipulation

Means and Standard Deviations of Masculine and Feminine Bem Sex Role Inventory Composite Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender of Advice-Seeker</th>
<th>Masculine composite score</th>
<th>Feminine composite score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male advice-seeker</td>
<td>5.88 (0.69)</td>
<td>3.61 (0.65)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n = 68</td>
<td>n = 68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female advice-seeker</td>
<td>5.51 (0.70)</td>
<td>4.12 (0.78)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n = 71</td>
<td>n = 70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Standard deviations appear in parentheses. All ratings were done on 7-point scales, and the higher the number, the more favorable the rating.
Table 3.2. Bem Sex Role Inventory Composite Score by Relationship Type

*Means and Standard Deviations of Masculine and Feminine Bem Sex Role Inventory Composite Scores*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationship type</th>
<th>Masculine composite score</th>
<th>Feminine composite score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental</td>
<td>5.74 (0.78)</td>
<td>3.61 (0.71)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(n = 71)</td>
<td>(n = 70)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiplex</td>
<td>5.64 (0.64)</td>
<td>4.12 (0.60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(n = 68)</td>
<td>(n = 68)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* Standard deviations appear in parentheses. All ratings were done on 7-point scales, and the higher the number, the more favorable the rating.
Table 3.3. Likelihood of Advice-seeking by Condition

*Means and Standard Deviations for Likelihood of Advice-seeking in Each Experimental Condition*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>$n$</th>
<th>Likelihood of advice-seeking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instrumental relationship</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male advice-giver &amp; male advice-seeker</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.16 (1.30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male advice-giver &amp; female advice-seeker</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4.46 (1.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female advice-giver &amp; male advice-seeker</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.21 (0.96)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female advice-giver &amp; female advice-seeker</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4.81 (0.73)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Multiplex relationship</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male advice-giver &amp; male advice-seeker</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5.88 (0.90)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male advice-giver &amp; female advice-seeker</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5.46 (0.98)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female advice-giver &amp; male advice-seeker</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.93 (1.45)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female advice-giver &amp; female advice-seeker</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6.04 (0.96)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* Standard deviations appear in parentheses. All ratings were done on 7-point scales, and the higher the number, the more favorable the rating.
Table 3.4. Likelihood of Gender-based Homophily when Advice-seeking

**Means and Standard Deviations of Likelihood of advice-seeking for Gender of Advice-seeker vs. Gender of Advice-giver**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender of Advice-seeker</th>
<th>Male advice-giver</th>
<th>Female advice-giver</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male advice-seeker</td>
<td>5.04 (1.40)</td>
<td>4.56 (1.24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( n = 31 )</td>
<td>( n = 32 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female advice-seeker</td>
<td>4.95 (1.10)</td>
<td>5.38 (1.04)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( n = 37 )</td>
<td>( n = 39 )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Standard deviations appear in parentheses. All ratings were done on 7-point scales, and the higher the number, the more favorable the rating.*
Table 3.5. Contrast Tests for Gender of Advice-giver * Gender of Advice-seeker

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contrast</th>
<th>Contrast Description</th>
<th>Contrast Value (Std. Error)</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does not assume equal variances</td>
<td>Male advice-seeker, Male advice-giver vs. Male advice-seeker, Female advice-giver</td>
<td>.481 (0.33)</td>
<td>-1.44</td>
<td>59.56</td>
<td>.155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Female advice-seeker, Male advice-giver vs. Female advice-seeker, Female advice-giver</td>
<td>.430 (0.25)</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>73.07</td>
<td>.083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Male advice-seeker, Female advice-giver vs. Female advice-seeker, Female advice-giver</td>
<td>.814 (0.27)</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>60.55</td>
<td>.004*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < 0.5
Table 3.6. Likelihood of Advice-seeking by Relationship Type

*Means and Standard Deviations of Relationship Type on Likelihood of Advice-seeking*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationship Type</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Likelihood of Advice-seeking</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>4.41 (0.12)</td>
<td>(4.16, 4.65)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiplex</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>5.58 (0.13)</td>
<td>(5.33, 5.83)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* Standard deviations appear in parentheses. All ratings were done on 7-point scales, and the higher the number, the more favorable the rating.
Table 3.7. Likelihood of Gender-based Homophily when Advice-seeking

Means and Standard Deviations of Likelihood of Advice-seeking for Relationship type*Gender of Advice-giver*Gender of Advice-seeker

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrumental</th>
<th></th>
<th>Multiplex</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male advice-giver</td>
<td>Female advice-giver</td>
<td>Male advice-giver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male advice-seeker</td>
<td>4.16 (1.30)</td>
<td>4.21 (0.96)</td>
<td>5.88 (0.90)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n = 15</td>
<td>n = 16</td>
<td>n = 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female advice-seeker</td>
<td>4.46 (1.00)</td>
<td>4.81 (0.73)</td>
<td>5.46 (0.98)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n = 19</td>
<td>n = 21</td>
<td>n = 18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Standard deviations appear in parentheses. All ratings were done on 7-point scales, and the higher the number, the more favorable the rating.
Table 3.8. Test of Between Subject Effects for Relationship type * Gender of Advice-Giver* Gender of Advice-Seeker

**Test of Between Subject Effects for a Three-Factorial (2 x 2 x 2) Design**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>62.638(a)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.948</td>
<td>8.341</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>3395.894</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3395.894</td>
<td>3165.256</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship type</td>
<td>46.607</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>46.607</td>
<td>43.441</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender Advice-Giver</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender Advice-Seeker</td>
<td>5.406</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.406</td>
<td>5.039</td>
<td>.026*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship type* Gender Advice-Giver</td>
<td>1.275</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.275</td>
<td>1.188</td>
<td>.278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship type* Gender Advice-Seeker</td>
<td>.094</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.094</td>
<td>.088</td>
<td>.768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender Advice-Giver * Gender Advice-Seeker</td>
<td>7.024</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.024</td>
<td>6.547</td>
<td>.012*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship type * Gender Advice-Giver * Gender Advice-Seeker</td>
<td>3.144</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.144</td>
<td>2.930</td>
<td>.089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>139.473</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>1.073</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3655.444</td>
<td>138</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>202.110</td>
<td>137</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a  R Squared = .310 (Adjusted R Squared = .273)
* p < .05
Table 3.9 Contrast Tests for Relationship Type * Gender of Advice-giver * Gender of Advice-seeker

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contrast</th>
<th>Contrast Description</th>
<th>Contrast Value (Std. Error)</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does not assume equal variances</td>
<td>Instrumental, Female advice-seeker, Male advice-giver vs. Multiplex, Female advice-seeker, Female advice-giver</td>
<td>1.581 (0.32)</td>
<td>4.929</td>
<td>34.992</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Instrumental, Female advice-seeker, Female advice-giver vs. Multiplex, Female advice-seeker, Male advice-giver</td>
<td>.653 (0.28)</td>
<td>2.335</td>
<td>31.010</td>
<td>.026*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Instrumental, Male advice-seeker, Female advice-giver vs. Multiplex, Male advice-seeker, Male advice-giver</td>
<td>1.667 (0.33)</td>
<td>5.069</td>
<td>29.893</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Instrumental, Male advice-seeker, Male advice-giver vs. Multiplex, Male advice-seeker, Female advice-giver</td>
<td>.778 (0.50)</td>
<td>1.543</td>
<td>27.667</td>
<td>.134</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p < .05
Table 3.10. Likelihood of Advice-seeking by Gender of Advice-seeker

*Means and Standard Deviations of Gender of Advice-seeker on Likelihood of Advice-seeking*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender of advice-seeker</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Likelihood of Advice-seeking</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male advice-seeker</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>4.79 (0.13)</td>
<td>(4.53, 5.05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female advice-seeker</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>5.19 (0.12)</td>
<td>(4.96, 5.43)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* Standard deviations appear in parentheses. All ratings were done on 7-point scales, and the higher the number, the more favorable the rating.
## Chapter Four: Conclusion

### Table 4.1. Summary of Results Across Studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Study 1</th>
<th>Study 2</th>
<th>Study 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sample Unit of Analysis</strong></td>
<td>Undergraduate students</td>
<td>Lawyers</td>
<td>Undergraduate students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key Independent Variables</strong></td>
<td>- Status of Advice-giver:</td>
<td>- Status of Advice-giver:</td>
<td>- Relationship Type with Advice-giver: Instrument vs. Multiplex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Higher vs. Equal</td>
<td>Higher vs. Equal</td>
<td>- Gender of Advice-giver: Male vs. Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Gender of Advice-giver:</td>
<td>- Gender of Advice-giver:</td>
<td>- Gender of Advice-giver: Male vs. Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male vs. Female</td>
<td>Male vs. Female</td>
<td>- Gender of Advice-seeker: Male vs. Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dependent Variables</strong></td>
<td>- Likelihood of Career-related Advice-seeking</td>
<td>- Likelihood of Career-related Advice-seeking</td>
<td>- Likelihood of Career-related Advice-seeking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Likely of Gender-based Homophily when Advice-seeking</td>
<td>- Likely of Gender-based Homophily when Advice-seeking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Influence Perception of Advice-giver</td>
<td>- Influence Perception of Advice-giver</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key Findings</strong></td>
<td>When seeking career-related advice:</td>
<td>When seeking career-related advice:</td>
<td>When seeking career-related advice:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H1 (+) Men and women prefer high status ties more than equal status ties</td>
<td>H1 (+) Men and women prefer high status ties more than equal status ties</td>
<td>H1a (-) Men do not significantly prefer same-sex advice-givers more than opposite-sex advice-givers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H2a (-) Men in higher-status condition do not have a preference between men and women</td>
<td>H2a (+) Men in higher-status condition prefer gender-based homophily</td>
<td>H1b (+/-) Women prefer seeking advice from same-sex advice-givers, although the finding is marginally significant, more than opposite-sex advice-givers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H2b (+) Men in equal-status condition prefer gender-based homophily</td>
<td>H2b (+) Men in equal-status condition prefer gender-based homophily</td>
<td>H2 (+) Men and women significantly more likely to seek advice from multiplex ties than from instrumental ties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H3a (+) Women in higher-status condition prefer gender-based homophily</td>
<td>H3a (+) Women in higher-status condition prefer gender-based homophily</td>
<td>H3 (+/-) Men are most likely to seek advice from same-sex multiplex ties and women are just likely to seek advice from same-sex multiplex tie as from opposite-sex multiplex ties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H3b (+) Women in equal-status condition prefer gender-based homophily</td>
<td>H3b (+) Women in equal-status condition prefer gender-based homophily</td>
<td>H4a (+/-) Women are just as likely to seek advice from same-sex instrumental ties as they are from opposite-sex multiplex ties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H4b (+) Women prefer multiplexity over gender-based homophily</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Figure 2.8.
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Figure 2.9.
*Overall Gender Manipulation for BSRI Femininity*
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Figure 2.10.
Likelihood in Advice-seeking on Status of Advice-giver (Main Effect)
Figure 2.11. Likelihood of Advice-seeking from Higher-level Male Advice-giver vs. Higher-level Female Advice-giver
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Equal-level Male Advice-giver (M=1) vs. Equal-level Female Advice-giver (M=2)
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Figure 2.14. 
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Chapter Three

Figure 3.1
Warmth-Competency Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competence</th>
<th>low</th>
<th>high</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Warmth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>high</td>
<td>Paternalistic prejudice</td>
<td>Admiration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>low</td>
<td>Contemptuous prejudice</td>
<td>Envious prejudice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low status, not competitive, pity, sympathy (e.g., elderly people, disabled people)</td>
<td>High status, not competitive, pride, admiration (e.g., in-group, close allies)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low status, competitive contempt, disgust, anger, resentment (e.g., welfare recipients, poor people)</td>
<td>High status, competitive envy, jealousy (e.g., rich people, feminists, Asians, Jews)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Fiske, Gudy, Glick & Xu, 2002, Table 1, p. 881
Figure 3.2. 
*Likelihood of Advice-seeking by Gender of Advice-Giver*Gender of Advice-Seeker
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Figure 3.3.
*Likelihood of Advice-seeking by Relationship Type*
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Figure 3.5.
*Likelihood of Advice-seeking by Relationship Type* Gender of Advice-giver* Gender of Advice-seeker*

*Female Advice-Seekers*
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Figure 3.6
Likelihood of Advice-seeking by Gender of Advice-Seeker
Figure 3.7.
“No Relationship” Robustness Check: Likelihood of Advice-seeking by Relationship type

- No Relationship: 3.5
- Instrumental: 4.5
- Multiplex: 5.5